# Cap AC:

## Advantage 1 is the Gun Industry:

#### Capitalism in the United States is centered in the gun industry – the industry contributes $33 billion and a ton of jobs. Getting rid of the gun industry and the NRA is the first step to destroying cap.

Hall ’13 Hall, Glenn. “Stubborn Facts: The Gun Industry Employs Twice As Many Americans as GM (and That’s Just the Beginning).” The Blaze. March 26, 2013. <http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2013/03/26/nr-draft-how-important-are-guns-to-the-u-s-economy-for-starters-the-firearms-industry-employs-twice-as-many-americans-as-bailed-out-gm/>

**Guns are big** business **in America** – so big, in fact, that despite making vastly more firearms than any other nation, the U.S. also is the largest importer of handguns, rifles and shotguns. Demand is so high, that on top of the 6.54 million pistols, revolvers, rifles, shotguns and other firearms made in America in 2011, an additional 3.25 million were brought in from other countries, according to records of the [U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives.](http://www.atf.gov/statistics/download/afmer/2011-final-firearms-manufacturing-export-report.pdf) Domestic production grew by 1 million guns from the 2010 volume and imports increased by half a million. All told, the firearms industry contributes more than $33 billion to the U.S. economy and supports about 220,000 jobs, according to the [National Shooting Sports Foundation](http://www.nssf.org/). **That’s more than double the North American payrolls** of General Motors, which [President Barack Obama called](http://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/remarks-president-american-automotive-industry-33009) “**a pillar of our economy**” when he explained the decision to provide more taxpayer aid to help save the car maker in 2009. Unlike [GM, which employs](http://media.gm.com/content/dam/Media/gmcom/investor/2013/q4/2012-Q4-Financial-Highlights.pdf) 101,000 people in North America and 213,000 worldwide, **the gun business is divided** up **among thousands of** little **companies** with just a few big, recognizable brands like Ruger, Smith & Wesson and Remington. Big or small, companies making and selling firearms and ammunition provide jobs in every state. (Click here for a [snapshot of the top U.S. gunmakers](http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2013/03/26/guns-at-a-glance-the-top-commercial-firearms-makers-in-america/" \t "_blank).) In Idaho, for example, Republican Gov. Butch Otter considers the firearms business “an important piece of the economy” in his state, which is home to one of the largest U.S. ammunition manufacturers — ATK Sporting — and has been attracting gun-related businesses away from other states that have enacted stricter gun controls or raised corporate taxes. Idaho’s firearms businesses generate $512.7 million in revenue and provide 3,116 jobs in the state, according to the NSSF. “Our idea of gun control in Idaho is to use two hands,” Otter joked during an interview with TheBlaze. “The gun industry doesn’t need to be afraid of Idaho.” Still, politicians in states such as New York, which recently passed what Democratic Gov. Andrew Cuomo called “[the toughest gun laws in the nation](http://www.governor.ny.gov/press/01152013-outline-of-nys-groundbreaking-gun-legislation),” often make a distinction between support for gun control and opposition to firearms businesses and gun owners. [Cuomo has said](http://wrvo.org/post/cuomo-says-gun-laws-wont-impact-remington-rumors-circulate) he doesn’t think New York’s new laws will have a “significant impact” on Remington Arms, which was founded in Ilion, New York, and he has stated several times that the gun control measures he signed into law this year are “[not about hunters](http://www.governor.ny.gov/press/01152013-outline-of-nys-groundbreaking-gun-legislation), sportsmen or legal owners who use their guns appropriately.” The NSSF estimates that New York-based firearms businesses contribute more than $1.2 billion to the economy and employ almost 8,000 New Yorkers — jobs the state has fought to protect with $5.5 million in subsidies and grants since 2007, according to the [Maine Center for Public Interest Reporting](http://pinetreewatchdog.org/states-have-subsidized-makers-of-assault-rifles-to-tune-of-19-million/). Those subsidies were approved prior to Cuomo taking office last year. As other states consider following New York’s lead on gun control and the U.S. Congress debates stricter federal measures following the Sandy Hook Elementary School massacre in Newtown, Connecticut, the desire to prevent such tragedies will have to be weighed against the popularity of firearms among Americans and the potential impact on an industry that has been growing steadily, even through the recent recession. Creating Jobs The number of employees in the gun industry grew by more than 10% from 2008 to 2010, adding about 17,000 jobs, according to the NSSF. During the same period, the overall number of Americans with jobs declined roughly 6%. The economic value created by the firearms industry also is increasing steadily, from $19.2 billion in 2008 to $27.6 billion in 2010 and reaching a record $33 billion last year, **according to NSSF** calculations based on wages and salaries. **Federal and state governments also benefit** directly **from the $5 billion in tax revenues the industry provides**, including $2.54 billion in business taxes and $460 million in excise taxes to the federal government, plus $2.1 million in state business taxes, according to the NSSF. The following chart shows the 10 states with the most jobs and revenue from the firearms industry: The economic value calculated by the NSSF doesn’t include sales of hunting and shooting accessories. A separate analysis by [Congressional Sportsmen’s Foundation](http://www.sportsmenslink.org/uploads/page/Economic_Impact_Report_E-version.pdf) found that America’s 37.4 million hunters and fishers spent $90 billion in 2011 on equipment ranging from boats and bait to guns and land for their sport of choice. Hunters and other sportsmen also have provided nearly [$1 billion in tax revenue](http://www.theblaze.com/stories/2013/03/25/u-s-gun-owners-sportsmen-generated-nearly-1-billion-for-wildlife-conservation-in-2012/) that supports federal wildlife conservation programs. **Private citizens are the driving force behind the booming gun business**, with **47% of American adults confirm**ing in an October 2011 survey **that they have a gun** in their home or elsewhere on their property — **the highest** level **in two decades**, according [Gallup](http://www.gallup.com/poll/150353/Self-Reported-Gun-Ownership-Highest-1993.aspx). Interest in hunting and shooting sports is growing, especially among younger generations, according to the National Shooting Sports Foundation, which estimates that sales of firearms and ammunition for hunting and shooting sports rose to a record $6 billion last year. While dwarfed by mega-companies like ExxonMobil, which generated more than $450 billion in revenue last year, the sporting firearms industry’s revenue is on par with other members of the [Fortune 500](http://money.cnn.com/magazines/fortune/fortune500/2012/performers/companies/biggest/), including Hershey, Ryder and Avis. In terms of employment, the firearms industry would rank 21st on the Fortune 500 list, one notch ahead of GM, if all the independent gun-related businesses were rolled up into one. When looking just at the businesses tracked by the ATF, **America’s gun industry includes 5,441 firearms makers, 1,895 manufacturers of ammunition, 48,676 dealers, 7,075 pawn brokers, 59,227 collectors and 811 importers.** Just looking at the dealers, firearms outlets outnumber car dealerships almost 3 to 1 and outnumber Starbucks stores by more than 4 to 1. Small, Independent Businesses The far-flung nature of the gun industry obscures the role the industry plays in the economy, said Jake McGuigan, the director of government relations for the National Shooting Sports Foundation. “There are a lot of smaller manufacturers that support a very large base of suppliers,” McGuigan said. “These kinds of small, independent businesses are really the backbone of the U.S. economy, not the GMs, Wal-Marts and other big businesses.” **The** relativelysmall-scale **operations in the U.S. firearms industry are** alsohighly **sensitive to** the **regulatory and economic landscape, as well as pressure from their loyal customers who tend to be** extremely **opposed to increased gun control measures**, McGuigan added. A [2011 ATF report](http://www.atf.gov/publications/firearms/121611-firearms-commerce-2011.pdf) noted that the number of federally licensed firearms businesses dropped by more than half from “a high of more than 286,000 in April 1993 to a low of 102,020 in March 2000, likely due in part to the increase in license fees and requirements to comply with state and local law implemented in 1993 and 1994.” The decrease occurred after the U.S. Congress passed the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 – the so-called federal assault weapons ban. Gun dealers saw the biggest declines, falling to 48,676 by 2011 after peaking at 248,155 in 1992, [according to the ATF](http://www.atf.gov/publications/firearms/050412-firearms-commerce-in-the-us-annual-statistical-update-2012.pdf). Licensed ammunition manufacturers also started disappearing after 1994, with 1,895 in 2011 compared with 6,068 in 1994 and a peak of 13,318 in 1983, ATF records from 1975-2011 show. Through it all, however, **the number of firearms manufacturers kept growing, reflecting the strength of consumer demand**. After expanding by a hundred or more businesses each year for most of the past three decades, the number of licensed firearms manufacturers shot up in recent years to 5,441 in 2011 from 2,959 in 2009 and 2,144 in 2004, when the federal assault weapons ban expired.

#### Bans kill the industry because they can’t legally sell to U.S. citizens, which are their market. That spirals down the whole supply chain and destroys confidence even if the public ends up with more illegal guns by making investors pull out. Flotterton 13’

New gun laws could mean economic woes for booming gun industry NICOLE A. FLOTTERON Contributor 3:32 AM 03/29/2013

As lawmakers consider a range of new restrictions on guns, the gun industry is growing nervous that its exceptional success during the “Great Recession” could be coming to an end. In the past four years, the gun industry has experienced an unprecedented level of growth, providing a rare boost to the ailing economy. But now, with states like New York and Colorado passing some of the strictest gun laws in decades — and Senate Majority Leader Harry Reid poised to bring a sweeping new gun control measure to the Senate floor — worries are growing about the widespread impact such gun laws could have on business. The gun industry employs approximately 220,000 highly skilled workers, according to a recent report released by the National Shooting Sports Foundation. Over the past two years, while the rest of the country faced unemployment rates above 8 percent, the gun industry added more than 37,000 new jobs, with average salary of $47,000. The report states that in 2012 alone, the industry paid $5.1 billion in federal taxes and was responsible for $33.6 billion in economic activity. Demand for new guns is high. FBI background checks for new guns through America’s 130,000 licensed firearm dealers have doubled since 2006, but with politicians pushing for various bans on firearms and magazines, the era of growth in the gun industry may be coming to an end. “It’s unfortunate. We don’t want to lay anyone off, but there is always the potential of layoffs,” said Joseph H. Bartozzi, CEO of shotgun and rifle manufacturer Mossberg & Sons. Most concerning to gun companies is the potential reinstatement a version of the 1994 assault weapons ban, which could be passed as an amendment to the bill that Reid will likely present in April. “If there were a federal ban on modern sporting rifles, which are mislabeled ‘assault weapons,’ it would mean a ban on the most popular semi-automatic rifle in the US,” Mike Bazinet, public affairs director at the National Shooting Sports Foundation, told The Daily Caller. For Bartozzi, it is the passage of legislation at the state level — not just the federal level — that has him worried. “We just invested $4 million dollars in new equipment and hired dozens of people to develop a product line that would be completely wiped out by the proposed Connecticut laws,” he said. In Connecticut — where Colt, Strum & Ruger Company and Mossberg & Sons are headquartered — legislators are considering a variety of measures to curb gun violence, including a manufacturing exemption, which would allow guns to be manufactured but not sold in-state. “What kind of public policy is that? To say to manufacturers, ‘We feel your product is not safe within our borders, but you can go and sell it outside our borders,'” said Bazinet. While some states are cracking down on the gun industry, others are capitalizing on the economic opportunity and inviting disillusioned companies to relocate. Last month, Texas Gov. Rick Perry sent a letter to 26 gun companies inviting them to relocate their manufacturing operations to Texas. For companies like Mossberg & Sons, which has been located in Connecticut since 1919, making a move to greener pastures is something to consider. “The proposed legislation in Connecticut would touch about 50 percent of our product line,” explained Bartozzi. “Being in Connecticut is a source or pride for us, but the fact that the state is about to make a decision that could hurt the company — we have to prepare for that and look at all options.” If companies were to start leaving states like New York, New Hampshire or Connecticut, the economic impact would go far beyond just gun companies. Most gun companies develop an in-state supply chain that can include everything from parts to food for employees. “In manufacturing, there is a ripple effect on economic activity. Legislators should stop and look at it that way,” said Bazinet. None of Connecticut’s five members of Congress responded to TheDC’s request for comment. For publicly traded companies like Smith & Wesson and Sturm & Ruger, the constant discussion of gun control has meant strong sales, but weak stock prices. When the gun debate flared up in the wake of the tragic Sandy Hook Elementary School shooting, Smith & Wesson’s stock decreased by 5.2 percent — a loss of almost $30 million.

#### Handguns are key to the industry and will only get more so, Plumer 12’

How the U.S. gun industry became so lucrative By Brad Plumer December 19, 2012

While private citizens still make up the bulk of gun purchases, the industry is also heavily reliant on sales to government agencies. Back in the late 1990s, the gun industry was actually facing decline, as the economy was humming along and crime fears were subsiding. Then Sept. 11 hit. Thanks to new counter-terrorism measures, law enforcement agencies and the U.S. military started buying up weapons at a faster pace, reviving the industry. Today, government agencies make up 40 percent of industry revenues: That's not necessarily good news for the gun industry in the years ahead. States are now paring back on budgets and law enforcement agencies are slowing down their purchases. IBIS World projects the gun industry to grow slightly more slowly in the next five years than it did in the last five. Case in point: In a recent filing with the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, for instance, Smith & Wesson noted as one of its “risk factors” that it had yet to secure a long-term contract with the U.S. military. “As a result, 89.0% of our net firearm sales remain in the sporting goods distribution channel.” 3. Handguns make up roughly half of the guns produced in the United States nowadays — and that number has been growing rapidly. In 2011, about half of the six million guns manufactured in the United States were pistols and revolvers. That's up from just one-third in 2001, according to a report from First Research. Rifles now account for 35 percent of the market, with shotguns and other guns making up the rest.

## Advantage 2 is Private Property:

#### Private ownership and protection of property are synonymous with capitalism. CHRISTMAN:

Reviewed Work: The Myth of Property: Toward an Egalitarian Theory of Ownership. by John Christman Review by: David Schmidtz Ethics Vol. 106, No. 1 (Oct., 1995), pp. 200-202

The view of property that says that owners have dominion over their goods in relation to all others is what I will refer to as "private liberal ownership," referring to the classic liberal stance toward individuals' entitlements to their possessions. Although this is a type of ownership and not manifestly a principle of distribution, it is a structure that has close connections with free (or nearly free) market capitalism. I will conduct an extended critical analysis of this paradigm of ownership and conclude that it must be discarded as a model of what it means to own something in a just society. As I will explain, private liberal ownership amounts to the enforcement of individual rights to use, possess, destroy, transfer, and gain income from goods (or if any of these rights are curtailed, it is not for the purpose of shaping the distribution of wealth in the society at large). That is, liberal ownership is a package of rights that is not regulated or reshaped for distributive purposes. There are many implications for this structure concerning limits on the regulatory powers of central governments, but one of the chief such implications is that any taxation on income (especially that gained through trade of goods in a less than perfectly free market) is ruled out by liberal ownership in that structure's purest form. Indeed, regulations or limitations on any of the rights listed for the purpose of correcting a distributive pattern are just what the paradigm of liberal ownership stands against. While the idea of liberal ownership per se may not be explicitly defended in many theoretical quarters these days (though it definitely is defended in some), it nevertheless occupies a central place in the general ideology of capitalist market societies. And like any kind of ideological tenet, its details are often not articulated in public discussion, or even in the minds of its adherents. A dominant assumption in capitalist societies is that property owners are in some sense the sovereigns of what they own (metaphors about homes and castles reflect this). And even if greater social needs, such as preventing starvation or aiding the disabled, override this sovereignty, they do so only after a fight. Owners of property always see taxation for these types of programs as an encroachment on their private domain, one which even if justified in the end, is an invasion nonetheless. This kind of thinking is also linked centrally with the public-private distinction crucial to the liberal (and capitalist) legal order. The government's power stops at the threshold of my home (or my car or my suitcase). This presupposes that the more or less full rights that I have over my possessions are part of the sanctum of activity that the state has no business invading, except perhaps for some tremendously weighty social goal. And liberal ownership, in this way of thinking, would afford citizens the greatest possible range of independence, privacy, and personal sovereignty allowable in a social order.

#### A ban on handguns is part of a broader strategy that deconstructs private property and capitalism, as it exists in the status quo. Through labor, one becomes alien to the rest of the world since your life becomes meaningless once you orient yourself towards private property. MARX 44:

Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts of 1844. Karl Marx “Estranged Labour”

All these consequences are implied in the statement that the worker is related to the product of labor as to an alien object. For on this premise it is clear that the more the worker spends himself, the more powerful becomes the alien world of objects which he creates over and against himself, the poorer he himself – his inner world – becomes, the less belongs to him as his own. It is the same in religion. The more man puts into God, the less he retains in himself. The worker puts his life into the object; but now his life no longer belongs to him but to the object. Hence, the greater this activity, the more the worker lacks objects. Whatever the product of his labor is, he is not. Therefore, the greater this product, the less is he himself. The alienation of the worker in his product means not only that his labor becomes an object, an external existence, but that it exists outside him, independently, as something alien to him, and that it becomes a power on its own confronting him. It means that the life which he has conferred on the object confronts him as something hostile and alien. ||XXIII/ Let us now look more closely at the objectification, at the production of the worker; and in it at the estrangement, the loss of the object, of his product. The worker can create nothing without nature, without the sensuous external world. It is the material on which his labor is realized, in which it is active, from which, and by means of which it produces. But just as nature provides labor with [the] means of life in the sense that labor cannot live without objects on which to operate, on the other hand, it also provides the means of life in the more restricted sense, i.e., the means for the physical subsistence of the worker himself. Thus the more the worker by his labor appropriates the external world, sensuous nature, the more he deprives himself of the means of life in two respects: first, in that the sensuous external world more and more ceases to be an object belonging to his labor – to be his labor’s means of life; and, second, in that it more and more ceases to be a means of life in the immediate sense, means for the physical subsistence of the worker. In both respects, therefore, the worker becomes a servant of his object, first, in that he receives an object of labor, i.e., in that he receives work, and, secondly, in that he receives means of subsistence. This enables him to exist, first as a worker; and second, as a physical subject. The height of this servitude is that it is only as a worker that he can maintain himself as a physical subject and that it is only as a physical subject that he is a worker. (According to the economic laws the estrangement of the worker in his object is expressed thus: the more the worker produces, the less he has to consume; the more values he creates, the more valueless, the more unworthy he becomes; the better formed his product, the more deformed becomes the worker; the more civilized his object, the more barbarous becomes the worker; the more powerful labor becomes, the more powerless becomes the worker; the more ingenious labor becomes, the less ingenious becomes the worker and the more he becomes nature’s slave.) Political economy conceals the estrangement inherent in the nature of labor by not considering the direct relationship between the worker (labor) and production. It is true that labor produces for the rich wonderful things – but for the worker it produces privation. It produces palaces – but for the worker, hovels. It produces beauty – but for the worker, deformity. It replaces labor by machines, but it throws one section of the workers back into barbarous types of labor and it turns the other section into a machine. It produces intelligence – but for the worker, stupidity, cretinism. The direct relationship of labor to its products is the relationship of the worker to the objects of his production. The relationship of the man of means to the objects of production and to production itself is only a consequence of this first relationship – and confirms it. We shall consider this other aspect later. When we ask, then, what is the essential relationship of labor we are asking about the relationship of the worker to production. Till now we have been considering the estrangement, the alienation of the worker only in one of its aspects , i.e., the worker’s relationship to the products of his labor. But the estrangement is manifested not only in the result but in the act of production, within the producing activity, itself. How could the worker come to face the product of his activity as a stranger, were it not that in the very act of production he was estranging himself from himself? The product is after all but the summary of the activity, of production. If then the product of labor is alienation, production itself must be active alienation, the alienation of activity, the activity of alienation. In the estrangement of the object of labor is merely summarized the estrangement, the alienation, in the activity of labor itself.

#### History flows my way – private property was used as a tool to oppress the proletariat in order to increase the capital of the bourgeoisie, which destroys labor structures at the foremost internal level. HIDALGO:

Ownership and private property from the perspectives of Hegel and Marx. By: Desiree Hidalgo The Agora: Political Science Undergraduate Journal Vol.3 No.2 (2013)

As it can be seen, private property is of main concern to Marx since it is caus[es]ing alienation of the majority and the generation of capital for a minority, and thus these are two connected issues. Marx uses the term alienation to describe how laborers are neglected of the development of their human faculties by being reduced to sell their labor in order to survive, as he says that the laborer becomes a “cheaper commodity the more he produces”19. Marx says of capitalism that it has, “centralised means of production, and has concentrated property in a few hands”20. If for Hegel private property causes freedom, private property for Marx causes alienation to freedom of the proletariat. Laborers as a cause aim for the “abolition of private property”21. Marx analyzes four ways in which the proletariats are affected by the private property of the bourgeoisie. He suggests that communists are attempting to change the mode of production in the given circumstances that world events occur, and he criticizes Hegelians for doing the contrary, as he claims, “in no way are they attacking the actual existing world; they merely attack the phrases of this world”22. Marx attempts to explain the material production that is facilitated by private property. He argues that proletarians have been used as a commodity in order to increase the capital of the bourgeoisie. In this way by using laborers as commodities, the bourgeoisie has divided labor, where the proletarians are working for the bourgeoisie as Marx puts it, “they are daily and hourly enslaved by the machine, by the overlooked, and above all, by the individual bourgeoisie manufacturer himself”24. The division of labour has different effects on the workers, but the essence of private property is impeding individuals to be free as they would be in other circumstances. Marx uses present situations to demonstrate why the abolition of private property would free the majority. According to Marx “the increase in value of the world of things is directly proportional to the decrease in value of the human world”25.

#### The ways we frame our policy determine its effectiveness – this means that a rejection of private property is instrumental to any rejection of cap.

Van Efferink, 10– Leonhardt, MSc in Financial Economics, MA in 'Geopolitics, Territory and Security,' working on a PhD at University of London, editor of ExploringGeopolitics (“Polar Partner or Poles Apart? How two US think tanks represent Russia,” PSA Graduate Network Conference, December 2010, http://www.psa.ac.uk/spgrp/51/2010/Ppr/PGC2\_Van%20EfferinkLeonhardt\_Polar\_Partners\_or\_Poles\_Apart\_PSA\_2010.pdf)RK

Methodology Informed by poststructuralism, we assume that “representations [of identity] and policy are mutually constitutive and discursively linked” (Hansen 2006, p. 28). Consequently, a think tank aims for consistency between its policy advice (“policy”) and its institutional context (proxy for “identity”) by using representations. this assumption is in line with the claim of Heritage (2010a) that its ideology forms the basis of its policy advice. Moreover, Brookings (Brookings, 2010b) has made it perfectly clear that its activities are meant to foster international cooperation. The second assumption is related to the first and concerns the position of the policy expert within a think tank: (Müller 2008, p. 326): “it is not the individual [i.e. policy expert] that structures and manipulates discourse but vice versa – discourses speak through the individual.” This assumption holds that the think tank’s institutional context (structure) conditions the autonomy of its policy expert to represent (agency). Alternatively, we could say that that “[i]n order to have their texts accepted as reasonable, geopoliticians [i.e. policy experts] have to draw upon discourses already granted hegemonic social acceptance [i.e. based on the think tank’s institutional context]” (Sharp 1993, p. 493). Our focus on institutional context is based on Dalby’s observation (1990a) that analysing geopolitical discourses requires an examination of the political circumstances**,** their sources and audiences and the process by which the discourse legitimises the authority of the source. In addition, Dodds (1994) suggests that texts about foreign policy are to be examined within several contexts such as the institutional setting. When interpreting text, we must consider the hermeneutics. According to Hans-Georg Gadamer (1989, p. 298), “the discovery of the true meaning of a text or a work of art is never finished; it is in fact an infinite process.” Gadamer was instrumental in the development of philosophical hermeneutics, which seeks to investigate the nature of human understanding. In his view, someone who analyses a text must be “aware of one’s own bias, so that the text can present itself in all its otherness and thus assert its own truth against one’s own [prejudices]” (ibid, p. 271-272). Our discourse analysis focuses on representations, informed by Dodds’ observation that (1994, p. 188) “[r]epresentational practices have increasingly been recognized as vital to the practices of foreign policy.” In addition, Agnew (2003, p. 7) argues that “certain geopolitical representations underwrite specific policies.” Next to representations (“what is being said about Russia?”), we assign meaning to lines of text by looking into representational practices (“how are things being said about Russia?”). These practices are relevant because “when something is recognized as a representational practice rather than an authoritative description, it can be treated as contentious” (Shapiro 1989, p. 20). We use a definition of discourse [allows] based on poststructuralism (Campbell 2007, p. 216): “a specific series of representations and practices through which meanings are produced, identities constituted, social relations established, and political... outcomes made more or less possible.” The usefulness of this definition also follows from its assumption that the think tanks’ representations are linked to both their institutional context (“identities”) and policy advice (“political outcomes”). Our study of discursive practices is informed by the work of three critical geopolitical scholars. First, we discuss analogies, labels and metaphors (Ó Tuathail 2002, 2006). Second, we search for cases of ‘geopolitical othering,’ identified by Dalby (1990a, p. 22/23) as “geopolitical processes of cultural dichotomizing, designating identity in distinction from Others.” This representational practice seeks to create a dualism in which a representation of one country means that the opposite is true for the other country. The practice implicitly suggests that the two countries have an entirely different set of values, one being “right” and the other “wrong”. Finally, we investigate the use of narrative closure which could take the form of referring to common truisms and presenting the complex reality “in easy to manage chunks” (Sharp 1993, p. 494). The practice leads to binary simplicity as the practice avoids complexity and problems that do not generate conclusions in terms of right or wrong. As a result, it dehistoricises, degeographicalises and depoliticises knowledge.

#### We don’t need to reject all of capitalism in once instance – moving in the right direction is key and rejecting private property is the first step to reversing the capitalist machine.

James Herod 2004 The Strategy described abstractly Section 6. of Getting Free

Thus capitalist structures (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected. We stop participating in activities that support (finance, condone) the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations. In this way our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist relations and force them out of existence. This is how it has to be done. This is a plausible, realistic strategy. To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism, is foolhardy. Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations. Such a revolution will never happen automatically, blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs. But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t simply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life, by millions of people. It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so. Nevertheless, there are many concrete ways that individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can gut capitalism, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always keep in mind how we became slaves [of capitalism]; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets, and so forth, we were forced onto the labor market in order to survive, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It�s quite clear then how we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse [by] this process. We must begin[ning] to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor and cooperatively produced goods.

## Advantage 3 is Individualism:

#### Guns atomize people by creating a politics of fear and individualism, which make cap inevitable.  DeBrabander 15:

Firmin DeBrabander 15 associate professor of philosophy at Maryland Institute College of Art, has written social and political commentary for numerous publications, including the Baltimore Sun, Common Dreams, Counterpunch, and the New York Times “Do Guns Make Us Free?: Democracy and the Armed Society”, Yale University Press, 19 May 2015,

Rousseau and Tocqueville maintain that democracies, like all states, devolve through political concentration. Viewing the young American democracy, Tocqueville deduces that extreme individualism greases the wheels of this process. Materialism sharpens our individualism and makes us devoted to personal gain, as opposed to personal glory, which is more amenable to civic participation. Egalitarianism ironically urges us to dissociate from others, Tocqueville suggests; if my neighbors and compatriots are neither above me nor below me, what need do I have for them? In the ancient régime, people in different stations relied on one another, and the pieces of society ﬁt together into a seamless whole. Not so in the new world: here, lamay be self-determining and self-sufﬁcient. Tocqueville offers a vision of aristocracy that is too rosy. He suggests that the masses should rely on the expertise of the nobility, who are bred and trained for leadership. But the American instinct to reject expertise and authority in favor of self-reliance is, for Tocqueville, at least equally disastrous. It is wonderful so long as it inspires the political attention and interest he witnessed in New England town meetings, but civic involvement is ultimately bound to lose out to capitalistic endeavors and the seductive joys of consumerism. Civic involvement has become a casualty in our own era, when we suffer from “time poverty,” as sociologist Juliet Schor put it: Americans put in long work days, combined with increasingly long commutes, and have little time or energy to interact with their peers, work for their communities, or even think much about politics.E This state of affairs is fueled by personal ambition, but also by plain greed. As Tocqueville presciently saw, Americans have little interest, and are left with little energy, to be political creatures, and to devote time to thoughtful and fragmentation of society into atomistic individuals, each pursuing his or her own endeavor in isolation or in contention with others, renders us vulnerable and ripe for oppression: “What resistance can be offered to tyranny in a country where each individual is weak and where citizens are not united by any common interest?”§q There is perhaps no individualism more extreme than that put forth by the contemporary gun rights movement. The NRA argues against the collective reading of the Second Amendment and insists instead upon the individual citizen’s right to amass a colossal private arsenal. The organization toils on behalf of individuals’ right to shoot intruders in their private abodes without accountability or social judgment. It works to ensure that individuals can act impulsively in private arguments, according to their personal whims, passions, and prejudices. It demands that they be permitted ammunition capable of piercing bulletproof vests worn by police. None of these advances a collective right or concern. It is to further the interests of each individual in being armed to the teeth, with whatever tools, for whatever purpose (provided it is within the law), and to have greater leeway in wielding and employing them. These arms represent a suspicion of the collective, and of the government that would represent the collective good. I argued in the previous chapter how these weapons are a mark of suspicion, and deepen the suspicion of the armed. A gun fundamentally severs its bearer from the community of his peers; it causes others to treat him with trepidation and fear—if they approach him at all. As open carry proponents proudly assert, their weapons are intended to serve as a warning. Saul Cornell chides contemporary gun rights ideology for promot[e]ing gun ownership primarily as “a means for repulsing government or other citizens, not a means for creating a common civic culture.”9Q This, he argues, is at odds with the aims and intentions of our Founders. He believes they did envision an individual right to bear arms, but it was never meant to be a right in isolation. It was to be linked to a civic function and to collective obligation. Cornell writes, The original version of a well-regulated militia was premised on the notion that rights and obligations were inseparable. Arms bearing was a public activity, a way of nurturing and demonstrating one’s capacity for virtue. The militia was viewed by the Founders as a vital political and social institution, part of a seamless web that knit the locality, the state, and the national government together into a cohesive political community. Cornell’s argument aptly depicts how the current gun rights movement undermines civic life. Gun rights, as they are currently conceived and championed by the NRA, are the ultimate go-it-alone rights. If our Founders felt that the Second Amendment would help oppose tyrannical government, it is reasonable to wonder how such opposition was ever to be mobilized. It could hardly happen in a nation of armed, isolated individuals, each in charge of a private arsenal. This purpose requires a trained, organized—regulated— force; it implies collective action, purpose, will, and commitment. George Washington grew tired of militias to the extent that they were loose collections of individuals. He wanted a ﬁghting force with cohesion, identity, and organization because he was a warrior, and he knew what war—or the toppling of tyrannical regimes—required. The gun rights movement pits the individual against society. Collectives are suspect, groups weak, their members sheeplike, obedient, pliant, and ultimately subservient. Collectives breed collective behavior, which is reprehensible to the movement’s bold, assertive, fearless, and morally certain adherents. People mired in collective sensibilities wait for the police to bail them out of threatening situations. Free, conﬁdent, strong individuals go it alone. Collectives are corruptible, their members easy to manipulate and herd. Only the independent individual is pure and inviolate. Political freedom thus stems from the uncorrupted and incorruptible sovereign individual. To gun rights advocates, that is the center and foundation of liberty. This much is clear from the political vision put forth by Napolitano and LaPierre: the principal political battleﬁeld, anticipated by the Founding Fathers who knew tyranny ﬁrsthand, is between the individual ﬁghting to retain his sovereignty, and the collective that would strip it away. This stripping-away takes place through, among other things, government efforts to regulate guns, abetted by those who would cede their freedom for the short-term prospect of personal safety. In the process, such people unwittingly empower tyranny. Dan Baum writes Guns are the perfect stand-in for one of the fundamental, irresolvable, and recurring questions we face: to what extent should Americans live as a collective, or as a nation of rugged individuals? We have the same ﬁght over health care, welfare, environmental regulations, and a hundred other issues. The ﬁrearm, though, is the ultimate emblem of individual sovereignty, so if you’re inclined in that direction, protecting gun rights is essential. And if you’re by nature a collectivist, the ﬁrearm is the abhorrent idol on the enemy’s altar.93 Baum articulates the dichotomy aptly, at least as it is viewed by the gun rights movement. Tyranny has also been invoked in recent debates over health care and environmental regulation. It follows from, and is symptomatic of, collectivism and anything that points in that direction. The gun rights movement offers us radical individualism—the sovereign individual—as the requisite remedy [which] But its advocates do not perceive, or refuse to admit, how politically debilitating their agenda is. Contrary to what they assert, their sovereign individuals, even armed to the teeth, are no match for the brute power of tyrants. Instead, the NRA and company unwittingly assist tyrants with their (as Cornell puts it) radically “anti-civic vision.”93 The gun rights movement undermines the collective or popular organization that alone might prove effective in countering a government bent on oppression.

#### Justifications through personal liberty and property overlook the sense of individuals existing within a community and as such support neoliberalism Esposito and Finley 14

[Luigi Esposito, Ph.D., is Associate Professor of Sociology and Criminology at Barry University in Miami Shores, FL & Laura Finley, Ph.D. is Assistant professor of Sociology and Criminology at Barry University in Miami Shores, FL. “Beyond Gun Control: Examining Neoliberalism, Pro-gun Politics and Gun Violence in the United States” April 2014. Theory in Action]

The parallel between Neoliberal ideology andwhat Melzer described as the “do-it-yourself” philosophyembraced bymembers of the NRA cannot be clearer. Not only freedom but democracy is assumed to be synonymous with self-reliance. Both neoliberal and pro-gun philosophy reinforce one another in that both presuppose an atomistic view of the world in which people are not understood as part of an interconnected community. Instead, all individuals areassumed to be autarkic subjects concerned almost exclusively with their own private lives. Far from supporting freedom and democracy, therefore, critics argue that whateasily resultsfrom this social imagery is a depoliticized citizenry that is anathema to an effective democracy(e.g., McChesney 1999). As is well known, a viable democracy requires that people have a strong sense of connection to their fellow citizens. Yet because of the emphasis on self-interest/self-reliance, neoliberalism attenuates democracy by giving individuals a green light to prioritize their self-serving interest over those of a community(e.g., Giroux 2008). The fanatical-like zeal with which many gun supporters prioritize [the] Second Amendmentrights over all other rights is consistent with this tendency. While those who support the Second Amendment emphasize the individual’s right to own firearms in order to protect his/her personal liberty, safety, or property, this right ignores the fact that individuals are also members of a community. More specifically, an emphasis on the individual’s right to own firearms [and] overlooks how that right might infringe on other people’s right to live without fear of unprovoked gun violence or unintended gun-related tragedies. And while ardent Second Amendment supporters might argue that guns are a tool to protect human life, there should be little doubt that the logic behind pro-gun/ anti-gun control politics—much like the logic advanced by neoliberal ideology— presupposes an “every person to him/herself” type of order as normal and even virtuous. At most, armed individuals might decide to take “heroic” action and come to the rescue of others during incidents such as mass shootings (much like neoliberals suggest that private charity should replace the welfare state as the primary mechanism for dealing with people in need), but the individual’s right to own firearms supersedes any communal/societal concern associated with gun violence.

#### Atomization fractures resistance to the mammoth of global capitalism by ensuring any resistance move is adapted and re-appropriated. Sinnerbrink 6’[[1]](#footnote-1)

<For Zizek, capitalism is the all-encompassing concrete universal of our historical epoch, which means that, while it is a particular formation, “it over determines all alternative formations as well as all non-economic strata of social life” (OwB, 185). But this does not imply, contra Deleuze and Guattari, that the Deleuzo-Guattarian figures of nomadic subjectivity, molecular becomings, or affective politics [do not] provide the only viable strategies of resistance against the established global order. As Zizek points out, contemporary neoliberal economics is very far from being, as Naomi Klein asserts, “biased at every level towards centralization, consolidation, homogenisation. … a war waged against diversity”22 (OwB, 185). On the contrary, contemporary global capitalism thrives on the very deterritorialising dynamic that Klein, along with some contemporary Deleuzo- Guattarians, sees as providing a vital source of micropolitical resistance to the global system. For Zizek, the important lesson here is that the appropriation of molecular becoming, impersonal affectivity, and other Deleuzian tropes into the dynamics of global capitalism—at level of the processing and management of subjective experience through the virtual vectors of media, marketing, and informational flows—means that we can no longer appeal to these tropes as part of any neo-romantic anti-capitalist critique. Far from presenting a marginalised or resistant mode of subjectivity, Deleuzian dissolved nomadic subjectivity presents a neat ideological fit with the deterritorialised fluxes of global capitalism. Rather than celebrate bodily becomings, impersonal affects, and presubjective intensities as sources of theoretical and practical resistance, Zizek thus urges us to “renounce the very notion of erratic affective productivity as the libidinal support of revolutionary activity” (OwB, 185).>

#### Framing justifications against cap are key to solve the system of cap - schools are the key battleground and acceptances or rejections make or break movements – taking an ideological stance against cap is key.

Louis Althusser, Marxist philosopher; Professor of Philosophy, Ecole Normale Superieure, 1970, “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses,” http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/althusser/1970/ideology.htm, web paging

That is why I believe that I am justified in advancing the following Thesis, however precarious it is. I believe that the ideological State apparatus which has been installed in the dominant position in mature capitalist social formations as a result of a violent political and ideological class struggle against the old dominant ideological State apparatus, [this] is the educational ideological apparatus. This thesis may seem paradoxical, given that for everyone, i.e. in the ideological representation that the bourgeoisie has tried to give itself and the classes it exploits, it really seems that the dominant ideological State apparatus in capitalist social formations is not the Schools, but the political ideological State apparatus, i.e. the regime of parliamentary democracy combining universal suffrage and party struggle. However, history, even recent history, shows that the bourgeoisie has been and still is able to accommodate itself to political ideological State apparatuses other than parliamentary democracy: the First and Second Empires, Constitutional Monarchy (Louis XVIII and Charles X), Parliamentary Monarchy (Louis-Philippe), Presidential Democracy (de Gaulle), to mention only France. In England this is even clearer. The Revolution was particularly 'successful' there from the bourgeois point of view, since unlike France, where the bourgeoisie, partly because of the stupidity of the petty aristocracy, had to agree to being carried to power by peasant and plebeian journèes revolutionnaires', something for which it had to pay a high price, the English bourgeoisie was able to 'compromise' with the aristocracy and 'share' State power and the use of the State apparatus with it for a long time (peace among all men of good will in the ruling classes!). In Germany it is even more striking, since it was behind a political ideological State apparatus in which the imperial Junkers (epitomized by Bismarck), their army and their police provided it with a shield and leading personnel, that the imperialist bourgeoisie made its shattering entry into history, before 'traversing' the Weimar Republic and entrusting itself to Nazism. Hence I believe I have good reasons for thinking that behind the scenes of its political Ideological State Apparatus, which occupies the front of the stage, what the bourgeoisie has installed as its number-one, i.e. as its dominant ide-ological State apparatus, is the educational apparatus, which has in fact replaced in its functions the previously dominant ideological State apparatus, the Church. One might even add: the School-Family couple has replaced the Church-Family couple. Why is the educational apparatus in fact the dominant ideological State apparatus in capitalist social formations, and how does it function? For the moment it must suffice to say: 1. All ideological State apparatuses, whatever they are, contribute to the same result: the reproduction of the relations of production, i.e. of capitalist relations of exploitation. 2. Each of them contributes towards this single result in the way proper to it. The political apparatus by subjecting individuals to the political State ideology, the 'indirect' (parliamentary) or 'direct' (plebiscitary or fascist) 'democratic' ideology. The communications apparatus by cramming every 'citizen' with daily doses of nationalism, chauvinism, liberalism, moralism, etc., by means of the press, the radio and television. The same goes for the cultural apparatus (the role of sport in chauvinism is of the first importance), etc. The religious apparatus by recalling in sermons and the other great ceremonies of Birth, Marriage and Death, that man is only ashes, unless he loves his neighbour to the extent of turning the other cheek to whoever strikes first. The family apparatus ... but there is no need to go on. 3. This concert is dominated by a single score, occasionally disturbed by contradictions (those of the remnants of former ruling classes, those of the proletarians and their organizations): the score of the Ideology of the current ruling class which integrates into its music the great themes of the Humanism of the Great Forefathers, who produced the Greek Miracle even before Christianity, and afterwards the Glory of Rome, the Eternal City, and the themes of Interest, particular and general, etc. nationalism, moralism and economism. 4. Nevertheless, in this concert, one ideological State apparatus certainly has the dominant role, although hardly anyone lends an ear to its music: it is so silent! This is the School. It takes children from every class at infant-school age, and then for years, the years in which the child is most 'vulnerable', squeezed between the family State apparatus and the educational State apparatus, it drums into them, whether it uses new or old methods, a certain amount of 'know-how' wrapped in the ruling ideology (French, arithmetic, natural history, the sciences, literature) or simply the ruling ideology in its pure state (ethics, civic instruction, philosophy). Somewhere around the age of sixteen, a huge mass of children is ejected 'into production': these are the workers or small peasants. Another portion of scholastically adapted youth carries on: and, for better or worse, it goes somewhat further, until it falls by the wayside and fills the posts of small and middle technicians, white-collar workers, small and middle executives, petty bourgeois of all kinds. A last portion reaches the summit, either to fall into intellectual semi-employment, or to provide, as well as the `intellectuals of the collective labourer, the agents of exploitation (capitalists, managers), the agents of repression (soldiers, policemen, politicians, administrators, etc.) and the professional ideologists (priests of all sorts, most of whom are convinced laymen'). Each mass ejected en route is practically provided with the ideology which suits the role it has to fulfill in class society: the role of the exploited (with a `highly-developed' `professional; 'ethical, 'civic, 'national' and a-political consciousness); the role of the agent of exploitation (ability to give the workers orders and speak to them: 'human relations'), of the agent of repression (ability to give orders and enforce obedience 'without discussion,' or ability to manipulate the demagogy of a political leader's rhetoric), or of the professional ideologist (ability to treat consciousnesses with the respect, i.e. with the contempt, blackmail, and demagogy they deserve, adapted to the accents of Morality, of Virtue, of 'Transcendence, of the Nation, of France's World Role, etc.). Of course, many of these contrasting Virtues (modesty, resignation, submissiveness on the one hand, cynicism, contempt, arrogance, confidence, self-importance, even smooth talk and cunning on the other) are also taught in the Family, in the Church, in the Army, in Good Books, in films and even in the football stadium. But no other ideological State apparatus has the obligatory (and not least, free) audience of the totality of the children in the capitalist social formation, eight hours a day for five or six days out of seven. But it is by an apprenticeship in a variety of know-how wrapped up in the massive inculcation of the ideology of the ruling class that the relations of production in a capitalist Social formation, i.e. the relations of exploited to exploiters and exploiters to exploited are largely reproduced. The mechanisms which produce this vital result for the capitalist regime are naturally covered up and concealed by a universally reigning ideology of the School, universally reigning because it is one of the essential forms of the ruling bourgeois ideology: an ideology which represents the School as a neutral environment purged of ideology (because it is . . lay), where teachers respectful of the 'conscience' and 'freedom' of the children who are entrusted to them (in complete confidence) by their 'parents' (who are free, too, i.e. the owners of their children) open up for them the path to the freedom, morality and responsibility of adults by their own example, by knowledge, literature and their 'liberating' virtues. I ask the pardon of those teachers who, in dreadful conditions, attempt to turn the few weapons they can find in the history and learning they `teach' against the ideology, the system and the practices in which they are trapped. They are a kind of hero. But they are rare and how many (the majority) do not even begin to suspect the 'work' the system (which is bigger than they are and crushes them) forces them to do, or worse, put all their heart and ingenuity into performing it with the most advanced awareness (the famous new methods!). So little do they suspect it that their own devotion contributes to the maintenance and nourishment of this ideological representation of the School, which makes the School today as 'natural', indispensable-useful and even beneficial for our contemporaries as the Church was 'natural, indispensable and generous for our ancestors a few centuries ago. In fact, the Church has been replaced today in its role as the dominant Ideological State Apparatus by the School. It is coupled with the Family just as the Church was once coupled with the Family. We can now claim that the unprecedentedly deep crisis which is now shaking the education system of so many States across the globe, often in conjunction with a crisis (already proclaimed in the Communist Manifesto) shaking the family system, takes on a political meaning, given that the School (and the School-Family couple) constitutes the dominant Ideological State Apparatus, the Apparatus playing a determinant part in the reproduction of the relations of production of a mode of production threatened in its existence by the world class struggle.

## FW:

#### The role of the ballot and judge is to reject capitalism and reclaim higher education.

#### 1. Challenging class focus must come first - cap has infected institutions and status quo modes of other forms of oppression – think private prisons for racist enforcement. Cap should come first because challenging it is necessary for all other oppressive structures – anything else ignores intersections between those oppressions, Ollman[[2]](#footnote-2)

So why should people involved in the social movements be interested in Marxism? Well—because most of them/us are also workers (white collar as well as blue collar), and Marxism is invaluable in helping to develop a strategy that serv[ing] es their/our interests as workers. Because the other forms of domination from which they/we suffer all have a capitalist component, and Marxism best explains it. Because even those parts of these oppressions that are older than capitalism have acquired a capitalist form and function, so that a Marxist analysis of capitalism is required to distinguish what is historically specific in their operation from what is not. And, lastly, because overturning capitalism is the necessary (though not sufficient) condition for doing away with all forms of domination, including domination over nature, and only a class conscious working class has the numbers (still), the power (potentially), and the interests (always) to bring about a change of this magnitude. Hence, the priority Marxists give to class analysis and class based politics (which does not rule out organizing around other oppressions at specific times for specific purposes). The priority given to class here (not to "the workers" but to "us as workers") has nothing to do with who is hurting more or which form of oppression is more immoral or which dominated group happens to be in motion, and everything to do with what is the adequate framework and vantage point for grasping the specific manner in which all these oppressions are interacting now and how best to get rid of them all. (And this is what Albert caricatures as a "master discourse"). I do not expect that simply making these claims has convinced anyone that they are right, but I hope they help clarify where the real disagreements between Marxist and social movement theorists lie, and, hence, what is worth discussing if we are ever to construct the united movement that is needed to achieve our—yes!—common goals.

#### 2. Our greatest ethical obligation is to resist capitalism – it’s relevant under any moral theory. MORGARIDGE:

Morgaridge, Clayton, Prof of Philosophy at Lewis & Clark College, 1998, Why Capitalism is Evil 08/22 http://www.lclark.edu/~clayton/commentaries/evil.html

Now none of these philosophers are naive: none of them thinks that sympathy, love, or caring determines all, or even most, human behavior. The 20th century proves otherwise. What they do offer, though, is the hope that human beings have the capacity to want the best for each other. So now we must ask, What forces are at work in our world to block or cripple the ethical response? This question, of course, brings me back to capitalism. But before I go there, I want to acknowledge that capitalism is not the only thing that blocks our ability to care. Exploitation and cruelty were around long before the economic system of capitalism came to be, and the temptation to use and abuse others will probably survive in any future society that might supersede capitalism. Nevertheless, I want to claim, the **putting the world at the disposal of** those with **capital has done more damage to** the **ethical life than anything else**. To put it in religious terms, capital is the devil. To show why this is the case, let me turn to capital's greatest critic, Karl Marx. **Under capitalism**, Marx writes, **everything** in nature and everything that human beings are and can do **becomes an object: a resource for, or** an **obstacle, to** the expansion of production, the development of technology, the growth of **markets**, **and** the circulation of **money**. For those who manage and live from capital, nothing has value of its own. **Mountain streams, clean air, human lives** -- **all mean nothing in themselves, but are valuable only** if they can be used **to turn a profit**.[1] If capital looks at (not into) the human face, it sees there only eyes through which brand names and advertising can enter and mouths that can demand and consume food, drink, and tobacco products. If human faces express needs, then either products can be manufactured to meet, or seem to meet, those needs, or else, if the needs are incompatible with the growth of capital, then the faces expressing them must be unrepresented or silenced. Obviously what capitalist enterprises do have consequences for the well being of human beings and the planet we live on. **Capital profits from** the **production of** food, shelter, and all the **necessities** of life. The production of all these things uses human lives in the shape of labor, as well as the resources of the earth. If we care about life, if we see our obligations in each others faces, then we have to want all the things capital does to be governed by that care, to be directed by the ethical concern for life. But feeding people is not the aim of the food industry, or shelter the purpose of the housing industry. In medicine, making profits is becoming a more important goal than caring for sick people. As capitalist enterprises these activities aim single-mindedly at the accumulation of capital, and such purposes as caring for the sick or feeding the hungry becomes a mere means to an end, an instrument of corporate growth. **Therefore ethics**, the overriding commitment to meeting human need, **is left out of deliberations about what** the heavyweight **institutions of** our **society are going to do**. Moral convictions are expressed in churches, in living rooms, in letters to the editor, sometimes even by politicians and widely read commentators, but almost always with an attitude of resignation to the inevitable. People no longer say, "You can't stop progress," but only because they have learned not to call economic growth progress. They still think they can't stop it. And they are right -- as long as the production of all our needs and the organization of our labor is carried out under private ownership. Only a minority ("idealists") can take seriously a way of thinking that counts for nothing in real world decision making. **Only when the end of capitalism is on the table will ethics have a seat at the table.**

#### 3. Anything and everything we know has been shaped by capitalist imagination and higher education has been coopted by the gun industry’s academic industrial complex.

Henry A. Giroux 15, 3-3-2015, "Henry A. Giroux," Truthout, <http://www.truth-out.org/news/item/29396-higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory//> AHS-DM

What happens to the memory of history when it ceases to be testimony?" - James Young (1) At a time when both political parties, anti-public **intellectual pundits** and mainstream news sources **view** the purpose of **higher education** almost exclusively **as a workstation for training a global workforce, generating capital for the financial elite,** and as a significant threat to the power of the military, corporate and ultra-rich, it becomes more difficult to reclaim a history in which the culture of business is not the culture of higher education. This is certainly not meant to suggest that higher education once existed in an ideal past in which it only functioned as a public good and provided a public service in the interest of developing a democratic polity. **Higher education** has always been fraught with notable inequities and anti-democratic tendencies, but it also **once functioned as a** crucial **reminder of** both **its** own **limitations and the** potential **role it might play in attacking social problems** and deepening the promise of a democracy to come. As difficult as it may seem to believe, John Dewey's insistence that "democracy needs to be reborn in each generation, and education is its midwife" was once taken seriously by many academic leaders. (2) Today, it is fair to see that Dewey's once vaunted claim has been willfully ignored, forgotten or made an object of scorn. (3) Throughout the 20th century, there have been flashpoints in which the struggle to shape the university in the interest of a more substantive democracy was highly visible. Those of us who lived through the 1960s remember a different image of the university. Rather than attempt to train MBAs, define education through the lens of mathematical utility, indoctrinate young people into the culture of capitalism, decimate the power of faculty and turn students into mindless consumers, **the university** presented itself as a site of struggle. That is, it served, in part, as a crucial public sphere that held power accountable, produced a vast array of critical intellectuals, joined hands with the antiwar and civil rights movements and robustly **challenged** what Mario Savio once called "**the machine**" - **an operating structure infused by the** rising **strength of the financial elite that posed a threat to the principles of critique**, dissent, critical exchange and a never-ending struggle for inclusivity. The once vibrant spirit of resistance that refused to turn the university over to corporate and military interests is captured in Savio's moving and impassioned speech on December 2, 1964, on the steps of Sproul Hall at the University of California, Berkeley: There is a time when the operation of the machine becomes so odious, makes you so sick at heart, that you can't take part; you can't even tacitly take part. And you've got to put your bodies upon the gears, upon the wheels, upon the levers, upon all the apparatus and you've got to indicate to the people who run it, to the people who own it, that unless you're free the machine will be prevented from working at all. (4) The 1960s may have been the high point of that period in US education in which the merging of politics, justice, civil rights and the search for truth made clear what it meant to consider higher education as a democratic public sphere. Not everyone was pleased or supported this explosion of dissent, resistance to the Vietnam War and struggle to make campuses across the United States more inclusive and emancipatory. Conservatives were deeply disturbed by the campus revolts and viewed them as a threat to their dream worlds of privatization, deregulation, militarization, capital accumulation and commodification. What soon emerged was an intense struggle for the soul of higher education. For instance, the Powell Memo was released on August 23, 1971, and authored for the Chamber of Commerce by Lewis F. Powell Jr., who would later be appointed as a member of the US Supreme Court. (5) Powell identified the US college campus "as the single most dynamic source" for producing and housing intellectuals "who are unsympathetic to the [free] enterprise system." (6) He recognized that one crucial strategy in changing the political composition of higher education was to convince university administrators and boards of trustees that the most fundamental problem facing universities was the lack of conservative educators, or what he labeled the "imbalance of many faculties." (7) Conservatives have a long history of viewing higher education as a cradle of left-wing thought and radicalism. The Powell Memo was designed to develop a broad-based strategy, not only to counter dissent but also to develop a material and ideological infrastructure with the capability to transform the US public consciousness through a conservative pedagogical commitment to reproduce the knowledge, values, ideology and social relations of the corporate state. Not only did the Powell Memo understand and take seriously the educative nature of politics, it also realized that if a crisis of economics was not matched by a crisis of ideas, it was easier to reproduce a society in which conformity could be bought off through the swindle of a neoliberal mantra that used the discourse of freedom, individuality, mobility and security to serve the interests of the rich and powerful. The Powell Memo was the most influential of one of a number of ideological interventions in the 1970s that developed political roadmaps to crush dissent, eliminate tenure and transform the university into an adjunct of free-market fundamentalism. But it certainly was not the first shot fired as part of a larger conservative struggle to shape US higher education. (8) Conservatives have a long history of viewing higher education as a cradle of left-wing thought and radicalism. As early as the 1920s, **conservatives were waging an ideological war against** liberal **education and the intellectuals who** **viewed higher education as a site of critical dialogue and a** public **sphere engaged in** both **the pursuit of truth and in developing a space where students learned to read both the word and world critically. Conservatives were horrified by the growing popularity of critical views of education and modes of pedagogy** that connected what students were taught to both their own development as critical agents and to the need to address important social problems. During the McCarthy era, criticism of the university and its dissenting intellectuals cast a dark cloud over the exercise of academic freedom, and many academics were either fired or harassed out of their jobs because of their political activities outside the classroom or their alleged communist fervor or left-wing affiliations.

#### The judge needs to reject capitalism, because status quo schools turn students to mindless consumers, Mclaren[[3]](#footnote-3)

The epistemological presuppositions that undergird neoliberal capitalism can be unraveled like an unspooled film; each application of neoliberal prescriptions to knowledge formation can be scrutinized in the context of the larger mise-en-scène. Cultural theorists have done an excellent job of understanding the impact of neoliberal ideology on the production of space, place, scale, historical time, and race, gender and class identity and human agency. I agree that this is important work and we need to look at such production in relation to the commodification of everyday life. Among other things, neoliberal logic is a logic of the lowest common denominator, a technocratic rationality in which value is accorded to how much surplus value can be extracted and accumulated..¶ While well-meaning progressive educators might be willing to criticize the manner in which humans are turned into dead objects that Marxists refer to as fetishized commodities, they are often loathe to consider the fact that within capitalist society, all value originates in the sphere of production and that one of the primary roles of schools is to serve as agents or functionaries of capital. Furthermore, they fail to understand that education is [can be] more reproductive of an exploitative social order than a constitutive challenge to it precisely because it rests on the foundations of capitalist exchange value. Reading Marx and Freire may not alchemize us into revolutionaries capable of transcending capitalism but ignoring what they had to say about transforming education in the context of class struggle would be a huge loss to our efforts.

#### Also it’s a contradiction to deny these arguments in the debate space. Pedagogy is never neutral – every position is actively promoting some way of understanding.

#### Three impacts:

#### A. It is our ultimate ethical responsibility to resist capitalism since it has fetishized our ethical existence, and has undermined the meaning to ethics. A prior question to any ethical prohibition is the need to resist capitalism.

#### B. The AC comes prior to any epistemic knowledge since capitalism naturalizes our thought and asserts control over our systems of thought.

#### C. Objectivity is a lie placing an absolute truth where there is none to find except for the fact that capitalism is violent and uses normativity as a shield to hide their lies of oppression. Refuse that ethical criteria and embrace higher education’s true calling.

# Frontlines:

## Underview Stuff:

### Handguns reduce violence:

#### Handgun bans reduce violence – best evidence proves:

LaFollette 2k (USF St. Petersburg Philosophy Professor) “Gun Control” Ethics 110 (January 2000): 263–281

The connection between availability of guns and murder—Perhaps the most well-established statistic is this: the more widely available guns (especially handguns) are, the more people are murdered. The figures are duplicated time and again in country after country. Here is the bottom line: "The correlation between any gun-prevalence and the overall murder rate is .67, while it is .84 between handgun prevalence and overall murder rate." " These figures are significant to the .01 level; that is, the chance that these correlations could occur merely by chance is less than one out of 100. This correlation meets the statisticians' gold standard.

#### Handgun ban reduces homicide—it’s the go-to weapon for criminals and the plan reshapes cultural values to lessen violence.

LaFollette 2k (USF St. Petersburg Philosophy Professor) “Gun Control” Ethics 110 (January 2000): 263–281

But this does not resolve the issue, for it does not establish what gun control advocates claim it shows, namely, that gun control is an effective way of substantially lessening the murder rate. First, a statistical correlation shows that two things are linked, but it does not tell us if the first caused the second, the second caused the first, or if there is some third factor which caused both. Second, even if the items are causally related, we do not know that changing the cause will straightforwardly change the effect since another factor might intervene to sustain the effect. Gun advocates proffer their own armchair explanation for the correlations: these correlations reflect the character of the respective social and political systems. The European countries where murder rates are lower have more social solidarity and are more heterogeneous than the United States. Whether these social factors explain all of the correlation is debatable, but I am confident they explain some of it. Were the United States to regulate guns as tightly as most European countries, our murder rates arguably would fall, but they would not plummet immediately to European levels. We might settle the issue if we could conduct controlled experi- ments, randomly dividing our population in half, giving half of them guns, removing all the guns from the other half, and then monitoring the murder rate. Of course, that would be morally unacceptable, po- litically unrealistic, and probably even scientifically unachievable. Be- fore we had enough time to exclude all possible intervening causes, sufficient time might have elapsed so that new intervening causes could have emerged. But we are not left in the dark. We have empirical evi- dence that helps adjudicate between competing explanations of the cor- relation. First, we have empirical evidence, bolstered by armchair arguments, that guns are more lethal than other weapons. Some claim the ratio is 5 : 1; no estimates are lower than 2 :1.12 This partly explains the strong correlation between guns and homicides. If people get angry the same number of times, those using the most lethal weapons are more likely to kill their victims. Second, the nature of secondary gun markets helps explain how the widespread availability of guns increases crime in general and homicides in particular. Various opponents of gun control claim that ‘‘If we outlaw guns, only outlaws will have guns.’’ Armchair arguments suggest why this is a silly claim. Where, one might ask, do criminals get their guns? They often steal them or buy them from those who purchased them legally. Even guns obtained from other criminals are usually traceable to people who purchased them legally. Empirical evidence supports this armchair supposition. Most criminals report having stolen their guns, received them from a friend or family member, or purchased them from someone who had stolen it. At least half a million guns are stolen each year, and these swell the numbers of guns available illegally.13 Not only does the primary (legal) market affect the availability of guns on secondary markets, it also affects the price of guns on those mar- kets, much ‘‘like the analogous markets for motor vehicles or prescrip- tion drugs.’’14 As we restrict the availability of guns in the primary mar- ket, the supply of guns in the secondary markets decreases and their cost increases.15 This increase in cost will diminish teenagers’ ability to obtain guns since they are least able to afford hefty prices. Since teenagers com- mit most deadly crimes, decreasing the availability of legal guns will thereby decrease the number of homicides. The converse is true as well: having huge numbers of legally available guns increases the number of guns on secondary markets and typically lowers their price. This makes it easier for prospective criminals, including teenagers, to obtain guns. Third, having a gun around the house (or on the person)—even for self-protection—apparently increases the chance that someone in the family will kill themselves with the gun or will be the victim of a homi- cide or an accident. One study found that ‘‘for every time a gun in the home was involved in a self-protection homicide, they noted 1.3 unintentional deaths, 4.5 criminal homicides, and 37 firearm suicides.’’16 This implies that for every case where someone in a gun-owning household uses a gun to successfully stop a life-threatening attack, nearly forty-three people in similar households will die from a gunshot. Taken together the evidence does not prove that widespread availability of guns increases the number of homicides. However, that empirical evidence, bolstered by earlier armchair arguments, makes the claim highly plausible. 2. The use of guns to prevent crime.—The biggest ‘‘gun’’ in the anti- gun-control lobby is the claim that having (and perhaps carrying) a gun prevents crime. As I noted earlier, this is a sensible armchair claim. Someone contemplating a robbery is more likely to proceed if they think they can succeed with little risk to themselves. So if a prospective robber believes the tenants are at home and have a gun they know how to use, then he likely will seek another target. Two surveys support this belief. According to one survey, 4 percent of all Americans have used a hand- gun in the past five years to avert a crime. Given those figures, research- ers estimate that there are at least 600,000 defensive uses of guns per year. Kleck uses these results, in conjunction with another survey, to claim that the number might be as high as 2.5 million.17 Given the num- ber of violent crimes using guns, ‘‘the best evidence indicates that guns are used about as often for defensive purposes as for criminal pur- poses.’’18 If true, that is a powerful reason to resist attempts to limit avail- ability of guns.19 Such statistics, particularly when bolstered by moving anecdotes of those who have saved their lives by having a gun, cannot be cavalierly dismissed by gun control advocates. However, these figures are inflated, likely dramatically so. First, Kleck’s methodology is flawed. Surveys have an inherent tendency to overestimate rare events. Kleck made his estimates based on phone in- terviews with people in 5,000 dwelling units. One percent of those units claimed to have used a gun defensively in the past year. Kleck inferred from these responses that there are 2.5 million defensive handgun uses per year. However, since this inference is based on an affirmative answer by one person out of a hundred, that means that for every chance for a false negative (someone who falsely denies using a gun defensively) there are ninety-nine chances for a false positive (someone who falsely claims to have used a gun defensively).20 The probability that this or some other bias skews the findings is substantial. Second, Kleck’s findings are inconsistent with findings by the Na- tional Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which interviewed far more people and interviewed them more regularly.21 Kleck’s estimates even clash with the findings of the NCVS on the incidence and circumstances of robberies (which seems less subject to reporting bias). If Kleck’s fig- ures were correct, then ‘‘Kleck asks us to believe that burglary victims in gun owning households use their guns in self-defense more than 100% of the time, even though most were initially asleep.’’22 Finally, if there were 2.5 million defensive gun uses each year, how many of those were necessary? Given the negative results of private gun ownership, gun advocates should show not only that guns deter crime but that they are the best way of doing so. Some people plausibly claim that owning a dog is an effective deterrent. If true, then a not insignificant percentage of those who used a gun defensively could have achieved the same results without the accompanying danger. In summary, there is no doubt that guns deter some crime and stop the completion of other crimes, just not in the numbers that Kleck claims. John Lott supplements Kleck’s argument by claiming that the widespread use of concealed weapons would decrease the annual number of homicides by 1,400; rapes by 4,200; aggravated assaults by 60,000; and robberies by 12,000.23 If true, and if there were no countervailing costs, this would be a powerful reason not only to permit guns but to encour- age people to have and carry them. However, Lott’s conclusions have also come under severe criticism: ‘‘The central problem is that crime moves in waves, yet Lott’s analysis does not include variables that can explain these cycles. For example, he used no variables on gangs, on drug consumption, or community policing. As a result, many of Lott’s findings make no sense. He finds for instance, that both increasing the rate of unemployment and reducing income reduces the rate of violent crimes.’’24 Perhaps the most compelling critique comes from Jens Lud- wig, who compares the rate of violent crime toward youths and adults in states that passed shall-issue carrying permits. Most of these states issue gun permits only to people over twenty-one. Armchair considerations predict that younger people, who cannot legally carry, will not receive the full benefits from the purported deterrent effect of shall-issue laws. Thus, those under twenty-one years of age are a natural control group to track general swings in crime. Once we include this factor, we find that shall-issue laws lead to higher—not lower—homicide and robbery rates.25 I also have an overarching worry about Lott’s conclusions. The one correlation in the gun control debate that seemingly is beyond dispute is the high correlation between the presence of guns—especially hand- guns—and homicide rates. Gun advocates offer explanations for the correlation, but no one I have seen seriously challenges it. I find it diffi- cult to square this correlation with Kleck’s and Lott’s claims that having more guns—and toting them—will lower crime. C. An Overall Assessment of the Empirical Evidence The strong correlation between the presence of guns and a higher mur- der rate is compelling. Since the correlation is statistically significant to a .01 level, it is difficult to believe that limiting private gun ownership will not have a noticeable effect on the numbers of murders. Gun advocates disagree: they claim that cultural factors explain the correlation. Al- though I think they are partly correct, they draw the wrong inference. For one crucial difference between European and American cultures is the widespread presence of guns. Each culture is the way it is, at least in part, because of the role of guns (or their absence) played in its creation and maintenance. Therefore, curtailing the private possession of guns might well change the American culture so that it would be less violent. Consequently, it is not only that fewer guns would directly cause some decline in violent crimes—which it should. It is also likely to reshape the cultural values which, along with the ready availability of deadly weapons, led to such an extraordinarily high murder rate in America. However, the statistical evidence that guns prevent or thwart crimes is suggestive and cannot be ignored despite its identified weaknesses. In summary, the overall statistical evidence tilts in favor of gun control ad- vocates, although the evidence is disputable. But we should not expect nor do we need indisputable evidence. We can act on the best evidence we have while being open to new evidence. If widespread availability of guns were responsible for even one-fourth of the increase in the num- ber of murders, that would be a significant harm that the state should prevent if it could do so in a relatively unintrusive and morally accept- able way. There is little doubt that we could do that, at least to some degree. If nothing else, we could control some types of guns and ammunition. To take one obvious example, teflon-coated bullets are designed to pierce protective vests. People do not use these bullets to pierce the vests on a deer or a squirrel, on a target or a clay pigeon. They use them to pierce the vests on people, usually law-enforcement officers. This ammunition has no purpose except to cause harm. Hence, we are justified in abolish- ing teflon bullets and in establishing severe criminal penalties for those possessing them. This would not save large numbers of lives. But, assum- ing the enforcement of this ban is not impractical, then, if it saved even a few lives, that would be a compelling reason to outlaw such bullets. Some guns, however, have a much wider use, even if they occasion- ally are used for ill. People have seemingly legitimate uses for shotguns and single-shot rifles. Consequently, barring strong evidence to the con- trary, we should not abolish them. We should, however, study their con- tributory role in causing harm and explore ways we might reduce this harm in a relatively unintrusive way. The central debate concerns handguns. The evidence we have shows that handguns are disproportionately used in homicides and in robber- ies. Although ‘‘there are approximately three times as many long guns as handguns in the US, more than 80 percent of gun homicides and 90 per- cent of gun robberies involve handguns.’’26 The experience in Canada suggests that criminals will not switch to long guns if handguns are un- available. Given the special role handguns play in causing harm, we have compelling reasons to extensively control, or perhaps even abolish, handguns. But policy considerations, mentioned earlier, should give us pause.

### AT Self-Defense:

#### Violent self defense doesn’t work for marginalized communities. If we follow the policy that the NC wants, that just involves putting these marginalized communities in jail.

Arkles, G. (2013). Gun control, mental illness, and black trans and lesbian survival. Mental Illness, and Black Trans and Lesbian Survival (January 3, 2014). Southwestern Law Review, 42(4), 855-899.

Because they are overwhelmingly targeted for violence and do not receive institutional protection from this violence, trans people of color and queer women of color are likely to genuinely need to defend themselves and their communities from violence. However, while according to law and public perception self-defense is justified, in practice the self-defense justification works more effectively for those accused of crimes against people with less privilege than they have. This dynamic explains why women are punished for fighting back against men who abuse them44 and why hate crime laws are used against the groups they are purported to benefit.45 Certain bodies are considered more worthy defense of than others.46 Famously, Bernhard Goetz, a white man, shot four young Black men he perceived as trying to rob him in a NYC subway.47 While many expressed outrage at Goetz’ racism, others acclaimed him as a hero.48 A mostly white jury acquitted him of murder.49 More recently, George Zimmerman, a mixed race Latino man who was widely perceived as white, shot Trayvon Martin, a young, unarmed Black man, and claimed he acted in self-defense. Zimmerman’s ability to claim self-defense was bolstered by the Blackness of his victim and his own perceived whiteness. Police accepted his account of Martin’s killing as true. Only after widespread public outcry did they question his story, ultimately arresting him for the murder.50 A jury acquitted him.51 Less famously, in the Jersey Seven case, young Black lesbians who defended themselves against an adult Black straight male attacker were promptly arrested and prosecuted.52 The young women were walking along a New York City street when Dwayne Buckle propositioned Patreese Johnson.53 When Johnson said no, Buckle became violent.54 Johnson’s friends came to her aid and they struggled.55 A couple of male bystanders joined the melee, trying to help the women.56 Buckle ended up getting stabbed.57 He recovered after emergency treatment.58 Mainstream media outlets depicted the young women in dehumanizing terms as a “gang of angry lesbians” and “wolf-pack” and reported Buckle’s self-depiction as a victim of a “hate crime” against a straight man.59 The women were the only ones arrested or charged.60 While a number of grassroots groups led by queer and/or trans people of color organized against the prosecution, widespread mainstream public outrage about the case never emerged.61 Johnson served almost eight years for her conviction arising from the incident.62 Similarly, CeCe McDonald, a Black trans woman, was attacked on the street in Minnesota where she was walking with a group of friends.63 A number of white, straight, cisgender people started calling them “niggers,” “faggots,” and “chicks with dicks.”64 McDonald told them to stop and in response got smashed in the face with a glass, causing injuries that needed eleven stitches.65 She and her friends fought back and one of the attackers, a man who had a swastika tattoo, got fatally stabbed.66 McDonald was promptly arrested and charged with second degree murder.67 She accepted a plea for second degree manslaughter and is currently serving time in prison.68 Again, while grassroots groups rallied to support her, the prosecution was unconvinced by her narrative of self-defense and the mainstream media did not pick up the story.69 As these incidents graphically illustrate, when Black queer women and/or trans people fight back against racist, sexist, homophobic, and transphobic violence, it is not perceived as legitimate self-defense. As INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence articulates, “The question of why there is so much silence surrounding the NJ7 case and similar instances of criminalization of women of color and queers of color lays bare the ways in which queer folks of color and women of color do not fit the racialized and gendered mold of who gets to be perceived as legitimately victimized or legitimately resisting oppression.”70

#### Owning a gun doesn’t protect you, but rather increases your risk of being shot by almost 5x. Grimes[[4]](#footnote-4):

Academics such as John Lott and Gary Kleck have long claimed that more firearms reduce crime. But is this really the case? Stripped of machismo bluster, this is at heart a testable claim that merely requires sturdy epidemiological analysis. And this was precisely what Prof Charles Branas and his colleagues at **the University of Pennsylvania examined** in their 2009 paper investigating the link between gun possession and gun assault. They compared **677 cases in which people were injured in a shooting** incident **with 684 people living in the same area that had not suffered a gun injury**. **The researchers matched these "controls" for age, race and gender**. They found that **those with firearms were about 4.5 times more likely to be shot than those who did not carry,** utterly **belying this oft repeated mantra [that guns protect and prevent rape]**.¶ The reasons for this, the authors suggest, are manifold. "**A gun** may **falsely empower[s] its possessor to overreact, instigating and losing otherwise tractable conflicts with similarly armed persons**. Along the same lines, **individuals who are in possession of a gun** may **increase their risk of gun assault by entering dangerous environments that they would have normally avoided. Alternatively, an individual may bring a gun to an otherwise gun-free conflict only to have that gun wrested away and turned on them**."¶ This result is not particularly unexpected. **Prof David Hemenway of Harvard school of public health** has published numerous academic investigations in this area and **found that** such claims are rooted far more in myth than fact. While defensive gun use may occasionally occur successfully, it is rare and very much the exception – it doesn't change the fact that actually **owning and using a firearm hugely increases the risk of being shot.** This is a finding supported by numerous other studies in health policy, including several articles in the New England Journal of Medicine. **Arguments to the contrary are not rooted in reality; the Branas study also found that for individuals who had time to resist and counter in a gun assault, the odds of actually being shot actually increased to 5.45 fold relative to an individual not carrying**.¶ The problem goes deeper than this, however. There's good evidence that the very act of being in possession of a weapon has an unfortunate effect of making us suspect others have one too. This was shown in a 2012 paper by psychologists Prof Jessica Witt and Dr James Brockmole, where subjects were given either a replica gun or a neutral object and asked to identify the objects other people were holding.

### Patriarchy:

#### Private ownership of handguns symbolize patriarchy and homophobia which is violent towards the LGBTQ+ community: Braman[[5]](#footnote-5)

Used to wrest national independence and to tame the western frontier, **guns are thought to resonate** as symbols of "honor," "courage," "chivalry," and "individual **self- sufficiency**."' ; These same associations also make gun possession **a**n evocative **token of masculinity; the custom of awarding an adolescent boy his "first gun" has been characterized as** "the bar mitzvah of the rural WASP,"" a "veritable rite[] of passage that certifie [s] [his] **arrival at manhood**. ''38 **As the tools of the** trade for both the **military** and the police, **guns are** also emblems of state authority, increasing the **appeal**[ing] of owning them **to individuals who hold** harshly **condemnatory attitudes toward social nonconformists** and law breakers."' But inverting these meanings, other individuals find **guns** repugnant. Just as they **signify** traditionally masculine virtues to some citizens, so too guns signify **patriarchy and homophobia** to others.0 While some see the decision to own **a gun** as expressing an attitude of self- reliance, others see it as **express[es]**ing **distrust of** and indifference toward **others: "Every handgun owned** in America **is an implicit declaration of war on one's neighbor**.""' For those who fear guns, the historical reference points are not the American Revolution or the settling of the frontier, but the post-bellum period, in which the privilege of owning guns in the South was reserved to whites, and the 1960s, when gun-wielding assassins killed Medgar Evans, John and Robert Kennedy, and Martin Luther King, Jr. To these citizens, guns are emblems not of legitimate state authority, but of racism and reaction."' From the historical and ethnographic literature, one can infer not only that the gun control controversy is culturally grounded, but that the cultural fault lines that divide Americans on this issue overlap sub- stantially with the ones featured in the cultural theory of risk. The association of guns with traditional gender roles and with state authority should make gun control anathema to individuals of a relatively hier- archical orientation. Those of an egalitarian orientation, in contrast, should support **gun control** as a means of **affirm[s]**ing **gender and racial equality**. Persons of a relatively individualist orientation should op- pose gun control, which they are likely to see as denigrating the ideal of individual self-reliance. By the same token, individuals who are less inclined toward individualism should favoi gun control in order to **express[es]** trustin**, solidarity with,** and collective responsibility for the well-being of their **fellow citizens**. These are the hypotheses that we decided to test.

## Cap Root Cause:

### Fem:

#### Feminism doesn’t work: the evidence of the united states demonstrates that the opposition between anti-capitalism and feminism has lead to the misery of American women.

Segal, Lynne 1991**[[6]](#footnote-6)**

It is certainly true that twenty years of feminism has failed to improve the economic and social position of all women, although it has brought many gains for some. This is as true in Britain as in most other Western countries. But nowhere is it quite so clear, nowhere are the contrasts between the lives of women after twenty years of feminism quite so stark, or the conflicts within feminism and their declining relationship to socialism quite so dramatic, as in the United States. The USA best illustrates the problems around feminism, identity politics and the Left. Despite the existence of the largest, most influential and vociferous feminist movement in the world, it is US women who have seen least overall change in the relative disadvantages of their sex, compared to other Western democracies. As Barbara Ehrenreich illustrates, within the professional middle class, women have made huge gains, increasing their representation among the most prestigious and lucrative professions by 300 to 400 per cent within a decade.[[10]](http://newleftreview.org/I/185/lynne-segal-whose-left-socialism-feminism-and-the-future" \l "_edn10" \o ")They have also cracked open the corporate business world, in which 30 per cent of managerial employees are now women, while Masters’ graduates from business school jumped from 4.9 per cent in 1973 to 40 per cent by 1986.[[11]](http://newleftreview.org/I/185/lynne-segal-whose-left-socialism-feminism-and-the-future" \l "_edn11" \o ")But outside the professional middle class, the situation for many women has been one of frustration, defeat and, for a significant number, increasing misery. The first big defeat for the women’s movement in the USA came in 1977 when the initial Hyde amendment was passed and Medicaid abortion was withdrawn, just four years after the right to abortion, affordable for women of all classes, had been won. The next, deeply symbolic defeat, ensuring frustration and retrenchment for feminist organizers and activists throughout the USA, came with the dismantling of the ERA (Equal Rights Amendment), exactly ten years after its resounding success when passed in 1972. Meanwhile, and connected with the defeat of ERA (as women of the New Right like Phyllis Schlafly mobilized around the slogan ‘STOPERA’), the Reagan decade of the 1980s had ushered in massive welfare cuts and steep increases in poverty—especially among black and ethnic-minority women and men. More women, particularly women raising children on their own, were not only poorer than women of their class and race had been twenty years earlier, but their poverty, with new spending cuts, became the more disabling. (They now battle to survive and raise children in an environment where, it is said, more people have been murdered in the streets of New York in the last fifteen years than Americans died in the Vietnam war. In this time of triumphal victory for the Right, some formerly self-declared feminists, like Sylvia Ann Hewlett, have drawn massive media attention by blaming feminism for the current plight of so many women in the USA. Feminism failed to protect women who are mothers, she accuses; claiming, falsely, that it never made demands of the state around child care and welfare.[[13]](http://newleftreview.org/I/185/lynne-segal-whose-left-socialism-feminism-and-the-future" \l "_edn13" \o ")Hewlett now opposes all equal-rights legislation in favour of an exclusive focus on child-care support for women. But her argument that it is women, and women alone, who in the end perform all the labour of caring is itself a capitulation to the very cornerstone of conservative thinking: the thinking that has overseen the deterioration in the lives of the poor, rewarded the rich, and—with its traditional family rhetoric and judicial removal of relevant funding—fought till it has all but smashed the seventies’ feminist vision of moving beyond existing gendered conceptions of ‘public’ and ‘private’ to a world where nurturing and instrumental tasks could be mutually shared by women and men. The growing immiseration of the US poor was not a product of the failure of feminist equal-rights and affirmative-action programmes for women; indeed many succeeded. It resulted rather from the now historic weakness of the US labour movement in protecting either male or female workers’ rights, or winning any comprehensive welfare system.[[14]](http://newleftreview.org/I/185/lynne-segal-whose-left-socialism-feminism-and-the-future" \l "_edn14" \o ")From its already battered and shrunken state in the early 1950s (around 30 per cent), after direct attacks from both corporate capital and the state, trade-union membership declined calamitously in the USA, down to its current 17 per cent. And, as research like that of Pippa Norris and others indicates, political parties and the level of trade unionism do seem to matter in assessing women’s relative disadvantages compared to men. In countries where there have been longer periods of social-democratic government and stronger trade unions, there is far less pay-differential and occupational segregation (both vertical and horizontal) between women and men, and far greater expansion of welfare services. In Sweden, that familiar example in many ways similar to other Scandinavian countries, where the Social Democratic Party has been in government since the 1920s and trade unionism in both the public and private sector is around 90 per cent, we find the highest levels of welfare spending and the lowest discrepancy between women and men’s wages (women’s wages are around 87 per cent of men’s).[[15]](http://newleftreview.org/I/185/lynne-segal-whose-left-socialism-feminism-and-the-future" \l "_edn15" \o ") Given that the USA is the only major Western democracy where women have failed to improve their wages at all relative to men’s over the last two decades (remaining at 59 per cent of men’s hourly wage, compared to Britain’s 69 per cent), and given the favourable contrasts between the Scandinavian countries and the USA regarding child-care facilities and other welfare benefits (again, Britain comes somewhere in between), as well as women’s proportionately far higher representation in parliament, it seems strange for feminists to ignore the traditional objectives of socialist or social-democratic parties and organized labour in their search for feminist goals and strategies, whatever their limitations and weaknesses, and however much their successes have depended on the hard and difficult slog of women within them. At a time when the advances made by some women are so clearly overshadowed by the increasing poverty experienced so acutely by others (alongside the unemployment of the men of their class and group), it seems perverse to pose women’s specific interests against rather than alongside more traditional socialist goals.[[16]](http://newleftreview.org/I/185/lynne-segal-whose-left-socialism-feminism-and-the-future" \l "_edn16" \o ")

#### Capitalism is foundation that grinded women’s role in society—family-household system emerged as the resolution to the effective reproduction to meet labor needs

Copland 15, Simon Copland, writer specialising in sex, culture and politics, “Sex and Society: Capitalism and Gay Oppression,” Simoncopland, June 19, 2015, <http://simoncopland.com/2015/06/sex-and-society-4-capitalism-and-gay-oppression/>

Here was the problem. In the early stages of industrialised capitalism men, women, and children all ended up in the factory. However, as people moved to the cities, the infant mortality rate shot through the roof. In Manchester, for example, there were a recorded 26,125 deaths per 100,000 thousand children under the age of one. This was three times the rate of mortality rater of non-industrial areas. With the rise of industrialised capitalism workers were robbed of control of production process, and in turn robbed of their capacity to incorporate reproduction into the needs of production. In simpler terms, being forced to work long hours in unsanitary factories made it much more difficult for workers to properly look after their children. And, as Tad Tietze argues, “this created severe problems for the system’s ability to ensure the reproduction of the working class.” Capitalists were watching as their next swathe of workers died in front of their eyes. Brenner and Ramas argue the creation of the “family-household system emerged as the resolution to this crisis.” The idea of the “family-household system” was introduced by Michèle Barrett in her book Women’s Oppression Today, described as a structure in which a number of people, usually biologically related, depend on the wages of a few adult members, primarily those of the husband/father, and in which all depend primarily on the unpaid labour of the wife/ mother for cleaning, food preparation, child care, and so forth. The ideology of the “family” is one that defines family life as “ ‘naturally’ based on close kinship, as properly organized through a male bread- winner with a financially dependent wife and children, and as a haven of privacy beyond the public realm of commerce and industry.” As capitalists were not willing, nor able, to provide services for parents to nurture their children (paid maternity leave, childcare centres, etc.) and with household services (maids, cleaning services, etc.) being too expensive for the working class, women were forced back into the home to look after children and complete domestic duties. As Tietze argues: “The capitalist family thus had to be consciously constructed, with all the coercive and consensual elements of that process — a process involving significant state and extra state mobilisation in terms of ideologies, laws, policies, regulations, work reorganisation, and industrial relations strategies, including settlements around the family wage, etc.” The family-household structure had to be developed in order to ensure the survival of the capitalist system. That doesn’t mean women stopped working, but when they did they faced particular disadvantages. Brenner and Ramas argue there were particular classes of women who were working at this time; those with children, who were widows and those married to men with unstable incomes. “These women constituted a particularly defenceless and desperate labour pool,” they write. With domestic responsibilities making it difficult to organise in unions and a lack of mobility making it difficult to find better jobs, women were stuck in lowing paying, often part-time work. Hence we see the development of the gender wage-gap — a gap that continues until this day. Herein lies the roots of female oppression under capitalism — roots we still see today. While some women have broken through the “glass ceiling” the majority still suffer both because of a historical disadvantage they have faced in the labour market, but also due to a capitalist class that is unwilling to provide the resources required to nurture children (which is still largely seen as a woman’s job). Paid maternity leave has been a huge fight, while services such as childcare are expensive and hard to come by. This leaves women still at a disadvantage.

### Queer

#### Capitalism is the root cause of queer oppression—history proves—an institution based on a need for labor resources depended on the nuclear family’s ability to produce workers

\*\*\*FYI, the nuclear family is a normative couple and their dependent children, regarded as a basic social unit.

Copland 15, Simon Copland, writer specialising in sex, culture and politics, “Sex and Society: Capitalism and Gay Oppression,” Simoncopland, June 19, 2015, <http://simoncopland.com/2015/06/sex-and-society-4-capitalism-and-gay-oppression/>

Where does queer oppression originate? Modern perceptions of anti-queer feelings a based primarily on the idea they are based in “fear”. Hence the terms “homophobia”, “transphobia” or “queerphobia”. Patrick Strudwick argues that fear underpins the majority of anti-gay sentiment: Being anti-gay is, without exception, at least partly fuelled by fear. Fear of the unknown, fear of unwanted sexual attention, fear of gender roles being flouted, fear of humanity being wiped out by widespread bumming, fear of a plague of homosexuals dismantling marriage, the family, the church and any other institution held vaguely dear. And, of course, never forget: fear of what lurks repressed and unacknowledged in the homophobe. Irrational fear. It’s a phobia, people. In mainstream debate this fear is boiled down to narrative of an “inherent conservatism” within our society, based primarily in religious teachings. Hence a teaching of queer history that largely ignores anything prior to the Stonewall Riots of 1969. Much like the story of the patriarchy, queer oppression, we have been told, is as old as society itself. Unlike the story of the patriarchy however it is much easier to look back in history and find multiple examples that disprove this idea. The most commonly used example is Ancient Greece — a society in which homosexual sex was elevated, seen as “the most praise-worthy, substantive and Godly forms of love.” Yet it is not just in Greece where we find this — we see varied and more progressive approaches to gay and lesbian activity in places varying from Russia to Africa. So why then, did gays and lesbians suffer oppression in some societies and not others? To answer this it is worth looking at queer oppression before the rise of industrialised capitalism. Britain for example has seen a long history of repression of homosexual activities. 1533 King Henry VIII introduced the “Buggery Act”, which mandated death for anyone convicted of “buggery” — a term used for any non-procreative sex, which was considered a “crime against nature.” This sort of oppression lasted well into the 1900s. What was the reason for this? The answer connects largely to the source of the nuclear family as it existed prior to the rise of industrial capitalism — an institution developed based on a need for labour resources to create economic surplus and wealth (primarily in this time to provide labour for farms). Queer sex and activities presented a threat to this norm, and in turn, in particular during times of economic need, these activities were actively repressed. Sherry Wolf describes this when discussing the North American colonies of New England: The need for labor in the colonies fuelled efforts by New England churches and courts to outlaw and punish adultery, sodomy, incest, and rape. Extramarital sex by women, who were considered incapable of controlling their passions, was punished more severely than extramarital sex by men. How has this translated during the rise of industrial capitalism? Just as industrialised capitalism had the potential to break the bonds of the patriarchy, John D’Emilio notes it also had the capacity to lead to greater freedoms for gays and lesbians. As noted in previous blogs capitalism weakened the foundation of family life as it brought people away from rural family life into more autonomous lives in the city. This is why Engels predicted capitalism would lead to the end of the proletarian family. This breakdown of the traditional family also allowed for greater autonomy for gays and lesbians. Yet, with this came a problem. While industrial capitalism opened the potential for the breakdown in the family unit, capitalists required families to stay together more than ever — primarily so they could reproduce the next lot of workers. This remains a fundamental contradiction of capitalism. This contradiction created a very unique situation for gays and lesbians. In The History of Sexuality Michel Foucault argues there have been two significant changes in the way our society approaches sexuality. First sex and our sexual desires shifted from something we simply do into something that reveals a fundamental truth about who we are, and second, with this, we have developed an obligation to see out that truth and express it. As Jesi Egan argues, “within this framework, sex isn’t just something you do. Instead, the kind of sex you have (or want to have) becomes a symptom of something else: your sexuality.” As industrialised capitalism developed sex shifted from something you just did, to something that formed a core part of your identity. In doing so our capitalist society was able to identify and target people who connected to this identity. It’s worth noting that this is an interesting, and largely positive step forward in society. Industrial capitalism allowed for the development of individuality that was not possible in previous social organisations. Despite attempts to oppress this individuality, as occurred with those with “divergent sexualities” this is largely a positive step forward.

### Race:

#### The history of discrimination against ethnic others is not rooted in skin color or geographic location but various strands of historical development that were united in the form of economic discrimination. Racism as it is understood in the modern era has its roots in 12th century ideological expressions of violence against the nascent capitalist merchant class, in the form of Anti-Semitism. The mentality of European colonialism and the birth of racism as we know it is positively and historically correlated with the advent and speed of economic development.

#### We’ll pre-empt you – racism pre-dates arguments misunderstand the ways ethnic discrimination manifest before capitalism. Old forms of discrimination were color blind and based on religion or military might, not ethnicity. Racism as a biological concept developed entirely from class discrimination.

IBT in 1993. “Capitalism and Racism”. 1917, journal of the International Bolshevik Tendency. Issue 12. Published November 1993. <http://www.bolshevik.org/1917/no12/no12capitalismandracism.html> CFC //we do not agree with gendered language. We actually vehemently hate it.

**Racism did not originate from a single source**, but rather from a combination of several strands of historical development that came together into an ideology with considerable persuasive power. **Racialism drew upon existing** cultural and national prejudices, and **pre-capitalist notions** **about nature and hierarchies**, **which** were gradually **adapted to new economic and social developments.** It has been widely observed that the **Mediterranean civilizations** of antiquity **were "color blind**": "The **Greeks and Romans attached no special stigma to color**, regarding yellow hair or blue eyes a mere geographical accident, **and developed no special racial theory about the inferiority of darker peoples qua darker peoples**. H.L. Shapiro notes that 'modern man is race conscious in a way and to a degree certainly not characteristic previously,' and points out that in earlier societies the ability to see obvious physical differences did not result in 'an elaborate orientation of human relations within a rigid frame of reference."  —Frank M. Snowden Jr., Blacks in Antiquity, 1970 **The slave societies of the ancients were oppressive** and often xenophobic. **Yet the entire concept of "race," as it is now** commonly **understood, was alien** to them. **Slavery in these societies was not defined by color, but chiefly by military fortune: conquered peoples were enslaved**. The rulers of **medieval Europe were also** largely **"color blind." Religion provided the touchstone** for the medieval world: **the crusades were launched against unbelievers, not against Arabs**. Similar **wars against "heathens**" and heretics **were conducted throughout Europe**, **for example, the** campaigns of the **Teutonic Knights** from the 13th to 15th centuries **to crush the Prussians** (non-Christian Baltic Slavs), **or Pope Innocent III's crusade against the Albigensians**. Anti-Semitism: Pioneer of Racism **Anti-Semitism**, **an ideological expression of the economic interests of the nascent capitalist class** within medieval society, **was the pioneer of racism**. In early feudal Europe **international trade was largely carried on by Jews** who maintained commercial connections with the Near East. By **the twelfth century the Jewish merchants were being displaced by Christians and were forced into moneylending** ("**usury**"—something that in theory **Christian merchants could not indulge in**) and other more marginal activities. Abram Leon (a young Belgian Trotskyist militant who perished in the Holocaust) noted that **anti-Semitism developed in tandem with the growth of capitalist activity within feudal society**: "The definitive **expulsion of the Jews** took place at the end of the Thirteenth Century in England; at the end of the Fourteenth Century in France; at the end of the Fifteenth Century in Spain. These dates **reflect the difference in the speed of economic development within these countries**.... **"Feudalism progressively gives way to a regime of exchange**. **As a consequence**, the field of activity of **Jewish usury is constantly contracting**. It becomes more and more unbearable because it is less and less necessary." "...**the Jews were progressively expelled from all the western countries. It was an exodus from the more developed countries to the more backward ones** of Eastern Europe. Poland, deeply mired in feudal chaos, became the principal refuge of Jews driven out of every other place."  —Abram Leon, The Jewish Question: A Marxist Interpretation **Anti-Semitism has proved a persistent form of racism, one that has nurtured** (and been nurtured by) **almost all subsequent forms**. **It developed a way of looking at the world which was generalized in the era of European colonial expansion. In Elizabethan England the ideas** and images **of racism were only partially developed**. **This is reflected in Shakespeare's rather ambivalent attitude toward race**. In The Merchant of Venice, **Shylock, the Jew**ish usurer, **is** treated as **a villain**. **Othello, a black Moor, is portrayed sympathetically as an articulate, intelligent and introspective human being**. There is a suggestion that Othello's downfall may be rooted in his passionate and temperamental Moorish nature, but this tendency is alanced by a presentation of other, more complex aspects of his character:"When you shall these unlucky deeds relate,  Speak of me as I am; nothing extenuate,  Nor set down aught in malice: then must you speak  Of one that loved not wisely but too well;  Of one not easily jealous, but, being wrought,  Perplex'd in the extreme; of one whose hand,  Like the base Indian, threw a pearl away  Richer than all his tribe...."  —"Othello," Act V, Scene II **It is difficult to imagine a Victorian writer creating as complex a black character as Othello**. **Stereotypes** could be vehemently derogatory or relatively, if patronisingly, sympathetic, but they **all presumed that biology determined destiny, for individuals as for "races**."

#### Capitalism is the root cause of oppression, especially contemporary racism – our kritik is a prerequisite to the aff

**McLaren et al., 4** – Distinguished Professor, Critical Studies, Chapman University (Peter and Valerie Scatamburlo-D’Annibale, “Class Dismissed? Historical materialism and the politics of ‘difference’,” Educational Philosophy and Theory, Vol. 36, No. 2, April, http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/doi/10.1111/j.1469-5812.2004.00060.x/full)//SY

For example, E. San Juan (2003) argues that race relations and race conflict are necessarily structured by the larger totality of the political economy of a given society, as well as by modifications in the structure of the world economy. He further notes that the capitalist mode of production has articulated ‘race’ with class in a peculiar way. He too is worth a substantial quotation: While the stagnation of rural life imposed a racial or castelike rigidity to the peasantry, the rapid accumulation of wealth through the ever more intensifying exploitation of labor by capital could not so easily ‘racialize’ the wage-workers of a particular nation, given the alienability of labor-power—unless certain physical or cultural characteristics can be utilized to divide the workers or render one group an outcast or pariah removed from the domain of ‘free labor.’ In the capitalist development of U.S. society, African, Mexican, and Asian bodies—more precisely, their labor power and its reproductive efficacy—were colonized and racialized; hence the idea of ‘internal colonialism’ retains explanatory validity. ‘Race’ is thus constructed out of raw materials furnished by class relations, the history of class conflicts, and the vicissitudes of colonial/capitalist expansion and the building of imperial hegemony. It is dialectically accented and operationalized not just to differentiate the price of wage labor within and outside the territory of the metropolitan power, but also to reproduce relations of domination–subordination invested with an aura of naturality and fatality. The refunctioning of physical or cultural traits as ideological and political signifiers of class identity reifies social relations. Such ‘racial’ markers enter the field of the alienated labor process, concealing the artificial nature of meanings and norms, and essentializing or naturalizing historical traditions and values which are contingent on mutable circumstances. For San Juan, racism and nationalism are modalities in which class struggles articulate themselves at strategic points in history. He argues that racism arose with the creation and expansion of the capitalist world economy. He maintains, rightly in our view, that racial or ethnic group solidarity is given ‘meaning and value in terms of their place within the social organization of production and reproduction of the ideological-political order; ideologies of racism as collective social evaluation of solidarities arise to reinforce structural constraints which preserve the exploited and oppressed position of these “racial” solidarities’. It is remarkable, in our opinion, that so much of contemporary social theory has largely abandoned the problems of labor, capitalist exploitation, and class analysis at a time when capitalism is becoming more universal, more ruthless and more deadly. The metaphor of a contemporary ‘tower of Babel’ seems appropriate here—academics striking radical poses in the seminar rooms while remaining oblivious to the possibility that their seemingly radical discursive maneuvers do nothing to further the struggles ‘against oppression and exploitation which continue to be real, material, and not merely “discursive” problems of the contemporary world’ (Dirlik, 1997, p. 176). Harvey (1998, pp. 29–31) indicts the new academic entrepreneurs, the ‘masters of theory-in-and-for-itself’ whose ‘discourse radicalism’ has deftly side-stepped ‘the enduring conundrums of class struggle’ and who have, against a ‘sobering background of cheapened discourse and opportunistic politics,’ been ‘stripped of their self-advertised radicalism.’ For years, they ‘contested socialism,’ ridiculed Marxists, and promoted ‘their own alternative theories of liberatory politics’ but now they have largely been ‘reduced to the role of supplicants in the most degraded form of pluralist politics imaginable.’ As they pursue the politics of difference, the ‘class war rages unabated’ and they seem ‘either unwilling or unable to focus on the unprecedented economic carnage occurring around the globe.’ Harvey's searing criticism suggests that post-Marxists have been busy fiddling while Rome burns and his comments echo those made by Marx (1978, p. 149) in his critique of the Young Hegelians who were, ‘in spite of their allegedly “world-shattering” statements, the staunchest conservatives.’ Marx lamented that the Young Hegelians were simply fighting ‘phrases’ and that they failed to acknowledge that in offering only counter-phrases, they were in no way ‘combating the real existing world’ but merely combating the phrases of the world. Taking a cue from Marx and substituting ‘phrases’ with ‘discourses’ or ‘resignifications’ we would contend that the practitioners of difference politics who operate within exaggerated culturalist frameworks that privilege the realm of representation as the primary arena of political struggle question some discourses of power while legitimating others. Moreover, because they lack a class perspective, their gestures of radicalism are belied by their own class positions.10 As Ahmad (1997a, p. 104) notes: One may speak of any number of disorientations and even oppressions, but one cultivates all kinds of politeness and indirection about the structure of capitalist class relations in which those oppressions are embedded. To speak of any of that directly and simply is to be ‘vulgar.’ In this climate of Aesopian languages it is absolutely essential to reiterate that most things are a matter of class. That kind of statement is … surprising only in a culture like that of the North American university … But it is precisely in that kind of culture that people need to hear such obvious truths. Ahmad's provocative observations imply that substantive analyses of the carnage wrought by ‘globalized’ class exploitation have, for the most part, been marginalized by the kind of radicalism that has been instituted among the academic Left in North America. He further suggests that while various post-Marxists have invited us to join their euphoric celebrations honoring the decentering of capitalism, the abandonment of class politics, and the decline of metanarratives (particularly those of Marxism and socialism), they have failed to see that the most ‘meta of all metanarratives of the past three centuries, the creeping annexation of the globe for the dominance of capital over laboring humanity has met, during those same decades, with stunning success’ (Ahmad, 1997b, p. 364). As such, Ahmad invites us to ask anew, the proverbial question: What, then, must be done? To this question we offer no simple theoretical, pedagogical or political prescriptions. Yet we would argue that if social change is the aim, progressive educators and theorists must cease displacing class analysis with the politics of difference. Conclusion … we will take our stand against the evils [of capitalism, imperialism, and racism] with a solidarity derived from a proletarian internationalism born of socialist idealism. —National Office of the Black Panther Party, February 1970 For well over two decades we have witnessed the jubilant liberal and conservative pronouncements of the demise of socialism. Concomitantly, history's presumed failure to defang existing capitalist relations has been read by many self-identified ‘radicals’ as an advertisement for capitalism's inevitability. As a result, the chorus refrain ‘There Is No Alternative’, sung by liberals and conservatives, has been buttressed by the symphony of post-Marxist voices recommending that we give socialism a decent burial and move on. Within this context, to speak of the promise of Marx and socialism may appear anachronistic, even naïve, especially since the post-al intellectual vanguard has presumably demonstrated the folly of doing so. Yet we stubbornly believe that the chants of T.I.N.A. must be combated for they offer as a fait accompli, something which progressive Leftists should refuse to accept—namely the triumph of capitalism and its political bedfellow neo-liberalism, which have worked together to naturalize suffering, undermine collective struggle, and obliterate hope. We concur with Amin (1998), who claims that such chants must be defied and revealed as absurd and criminal, and who puts the challenge we face in no uncertain terms: humanity may let itself be led by capitalism's logic to a fate of collective suicide or it may pave the way for an alternative humanist project of global socialism. The grosteque conditions that inspired Marx to pen his original critique of capitalism are present and flourishing. The inequalities of wealth and the gross imbalances of power that exist today are leading to abuses that exceed those encountered in Marx's day (Greider, 1998, p. 39). Global capitalism has paved the way for the obscene concentration of wealth in fewer and fewer hands and created a world increasingly divided between those who enjoy opulent affluence and those who languish in dehumanizing conditions and economic misery. In every corner of the globe, we are witnessing social disintegration as revealed by a rise in abject poverty and inequality. At the current historical juncture, the combined assets of the 225 richest people is roughly equal to the annual income of the poorest 47 percent of the world's population, while the combined assets of the three richest people exceed the combined GDP of the 48 poorest nations (CCPA, 2002, p. 3). Approximately 2.8 billion people—almost half of the world's population—struggle in desperation to live on less than two dollars a day (McQuaig, 2001, p. 27). As many as 250 million children are wage slaves and there are over a billion workers who are either un- or under-employed. These are the concrete realities of our time—realities that require a vigorous class analysis, an unrelenting critique of capitalism and an oppositional politics capable of confronting what Ahmad (1998, p. 2) refers to as ‘capitalist universality.’ They are realities that require something more than that which is offered by the prophets of ‘difference’ and post-Marxists who would have us relegate socialism to the scrapheap of history and mummify Marxism along with Lenin's corpse. Never before has a Marxian analysis of capitalism and class rule been so desperately needed. That is not to say that everything Marx said or anticipated has come true, for that is clearly not the case. Many critiques of Marx focus on his strategy for moving toward socialism, and with ample justification; nonetheless Marx did provide us with fundamental insights into class society that have held true to this day. Marx's enduring relevance lies in his indictment of capitalism which continues to wreak havoc in the lives of most. While capitalism's cheerleaders have attempted to hide its sordid underbelly, Marx's description of capitalism as the sorcerer's dark power is even more apt in light of contemporary historical and economic conditions. Rather than jettisoning Marx, decentering the role of capitalism, and discrediting class analysis, radical educators must continue to engage Marx's oeuvre and extrapolate from it that which is useful pedagogically, theoretically, and, most importantly, politically in light of the challenges that confront us.

#### Critical race theory and intersectional approaches displace the essential focus on class in relation to racial issues – class, as informed by patterns of labor and productivity, is the only structural antagonism determinant of practices sanctioning racial and gender oppression

San Juan, Professor Emeritus of English/Comparative Literature/Ethnic Studies at Harvard, 2005 (Epifanio San Juan, Jr., Nature, Society, and Thought, Vol 3 Iss 18 2005 “From Race to Class Struggle: Marxism and Critical Race Theory” proquest; accessed 7/21/15)//JH @ DDI

Owing to the unrelenting ideological and political constraints of the Cold War, academic discourse on racism and ethnic/racial relations has erased the Marxian concept of class as an antagonistic relation, displacing it with neo-Weberian notions of status, life-style, and other cultural contingencies. Despite the civil rights struggles of the sixties, methodological individualism and normative functionalism continue to prevail in the humanities and social sciences. The decline of militant trade unionism and the attenuation of "third world" liberation struggles contributed to the erasure of class conflicts. With the introduction of structuralist and poststructuralist paradigms in the last three decades, the concept of class struggle has been effectively displaced by the concept of power and differential relations. From the viewpoint of the humanities and cultural studies (fields in which I am somehow implicated), the advent of critical race theory (CRT) in the eighties was salutary if not anticlimactic. For the strategic foregrounding of racism and the race problematic (following feminism's assault on the Cold War stereotypes of economic determinism and class reductionism synonymous with Marxism tout court in the previous decades), CRT served to remedy the inadequacies of the intersectionality paradigm of gender, class, and race. Unfortunately, with the neoconservative resurgence in the Reagan/Bush administrations and the collapse of "actually existing socialism" in the Soviet Union and arguably in China, the deconstruction of bourgeois legal discourse and its attendant institutions will no longer suffice. This is so not only because of the reconfigured international situation and the emergence of neoliberal apologetics and authoritarian decrees, but because of the accelerated class war manifest in ongoing deindustrialization, huge income gaps, unemployment, destruction of welfare-state guarantees, and disabling of traditional challenges to corporate rule. Challenge of the epochal divide The advent of critical race theory marked a rediscovery of the primacy of the social relations of production and the division of labor in late modern industrial society. A historicizing perspective was applied by Derrick Bell and elaborated by, among others, Charles Mills in his theory of the United States as a "racial polity." However, a tendency to juxtapose "class" as a classifying category with "race" and "gender" in an intersectional framework has disabled the Marxian concept of class relation as a structural determinant. This has led to the reduction of the relational dynamic of class to an economistic factor of identity, even though critical race theory attacks capitalist relations of production and its legal ideology as the ground for racist practices and institutions. The intersectionality approach (where race, class, and gender function as equally salient variables) so fashionable today substitutes a static nominalism for concrete class analysis. It displaces a Marxian with a Weberian organon of knowledge. As Gregory Meyerson notes, the "explanatory primacy of class analysis" is a theoretical requisite for understanding the structural determinants of race, gender, and class oppression (2003). Class as an antagonistic relation is, from a historical-materialist viewpoint, the only structural determinant of ideologies and practices sanctioning racial and gender oppression in capitalist society.

### Biopower

#### Biopower is a symptom of capitalism’s control of subjectivity – the authoritative valuation of life within biopolitical systems emerges from the dominance of capital

McGowan teaches theory and film at the University of Vermont, 2013 (Todd, Discourse Volume 35, Number 1, Winter 2013 “The Capitalist Gaze” project muse; accessed 7/20/15)//JH@DDI

The emergence of biopower and even biopolitical analysis in contemporary social relations is a symptom of the full acceptance of capitalism’s existence as a substance providing ground for our subjectivity. Biopower takes the living body as its object, which represents a radical departure for the way that social authority functions. Rather than threatening death, authority constitutes itself through preserving, regulating, and even producing life.7 The concern for life develops out of a sense that life is itself the source of all value and that nothing exists outside of life. The development of this valuation of life depends on the dominance of capitalism, an economic system that passes itself off as identical to the structure of natural life.8

# Show Martin:

#### Voting negative is not an endorsement of debate as a Marxist sect but rather a view of debate as an educational experiment. Debate is a zone for intellectual alignment, not revolution. Vote negative if our view of the political is better than the affirmatives.

David Graeber, London School, 2005 “Roundtable: Anticapitalism and Academics,” Stevphen Shukaitis, Radical Society 30: 3-4, pp 85-93, p 89-90)

The first reaction you got across the board from the media and largely from academics is "Oh, these people are stupid, they're so dumb-they don't know anything (like pundits on TV who really understand things) about the IMF." As academic intellectuals we should be collectively ashamed of that first reaction because in point of fact what I did was simply join. Just showed up. Didn't claim to know what was going on because I didn't. And just tried to see what was happening. What I quickly discovered was that the forms of practice, like consensus process-these were things that academics hadn't dreamed of and that have profound implications not only for political action but just for how we should conduct ourselves intellectually, too. It made me realize how the very style of academic thought and debate resembles absurd tiny Marxist sects a lot more than groups that actually get anything done. It's exactly the reverse of vanguardism; at this moment we should think of ourselves, insofar as we are academics, as learning and trying to reform our practice-intellectual practice-through the lessons that people are learning who are engaged in actual political struggles. My conception of the ultimate relation, which I have given a lot of thought to recently-if we're not going to be a vanguard what are we? I'm an anthropologist, and it occurs to me that the idea of ethnography is unusually kind of fertile here. Ethnography has been used in a number of very obnoxious ways. But it's also something that holds potential-what it's about is looking at forms of praxis and teasing out the underlying logical, moral principles that might not be entirely apparent to the people doing it. I think those tools are useful. We should be studying forms of resistance, forms of creative alternatives that exist, and trying to extrapolate from them as part of a process of dialogue. Insofar as these new movements will have a role specifically for intellectuals it's a combination of that ethnographic impulse and a certain type of Utopian imaginary to say, "Well, if you applied the same principles in your political structure to economics, might it not look like something like this?" Sort of tossing things back and forth. So that type of dialogue is the starting point of how one can conduct it. We're just at the beginning of thinking about what that discourse would look like, how we would really conduct it. I've thrown out some ideas previously about how we might be going about this, some directions at least to look at. I think one of the most important ones is to think about what we're doing somewhat in the spirit of a gift economy. To make a gift of your ideas is to make them translatable and something that people can take away in ways that maybe you didn't expect. And I think the first thing one has to do in doing that is to phrase them in language that people don't have to have taken seven years of grad school to be able to understand. That itself is a lot work-it's hard if you've gone through seven years of grad school to remember how to do that. There's a lot of unlearning to do. Because otherwise it becomes attached to you. I think there's a way that everybody in academics is designed around being a "great thinker"-a sort of "great man" theory of history embodied there, much as there is in a sectarian Marxist logic where every school of Marxism comes out of the brain of some great thinker. We need to move away from that and come up with ideas that aren't ours-ideas that can freely circulate and be useful for other people. One of the first ways to do that is to make them detachable from yourself, is to not make them so obscure, complex, and ambiguous that they need to constantly refer back to you to even understand what they mean. I really don't have as much answers as ideas of directions that we need to be thinking about going. This project is something that is really just beginning. There's enormous room for thinking these things out. We just started to explore entirely new territory.
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